

OCT 26 1917
UNIV. OF MICH.
DEAN

VOLUME XII

NUMBER 4

October 1917

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to research
in the Languages, Literatures, History,
and Life of Classical Antiquity ♡ ♡

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

*The Cambridge University Press, London and Edinburgh; The Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha,
Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka, Sendai; The Mission Book Company, Shanghai*

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

CHARLES HENRY BRESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
CARL DARLING BUCK

PAUL SHORRY, *Managing Editor*
WILLIAM GARDNER HALE
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
ELMER TUESDELL MERRILL

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER
HENRY W. PRESCOTT
FRANK RIGGLOW TARBELL

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK FROST ABBOTT, *Princeton University*
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
FRANCIS W. KELSEY, *University of Michigan*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*
HANS OERTEL, *Yale University*

WILLIAM PETERSON, *McGill University*
SAMUEL BALL PLATNER, *Western Reserve University*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*
BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, *University of California*

VOL. XII

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER 1917

No. 4

Horace and Valerius Cato	By G. L. Hendrickson	329
Ethnology and the Golden Age	By George Norlin	351
The Sources and the Extent of Petrarch's Knowledge of the Life of Vergil	By Duane Reed Stuart	365
The Antecedents of Hellenistic Comedy	By Henry W. Prescott	405
Land Reclamation in the Fayum under Ptolemies Philadelphus and Euergetes I	By W. L. Westermann	426
Notes and Discussions		491
JEFFERSON ELMORE: Professor Reid on Cicero.—CHARLES KNAPP: Horace, <i>Sermones</i> ii. l. 34-36.—PAUL SHORRY: Note on Plato <i>Republic</i> 388A.—ANDREW B. ANDERSON: Greek Parallels for <i>Cygnus</i> etc.		
Book Reviews		499
QUIDGEN: <i>Essays and Studies Presented to William Budge on His Sixtieth Birthday</i> (Bonner).—KÖRTE: <i>Die griechische Komödie</i> (Prescott).—LEGRAND: <i>The New Greek Comedy</i> (Knappe).—MENDALL: <i>Latin Sentence Connection</i> (Billings).—STERRITT-JONES: <i>The Geography of Strabo</i> (Manser).—BERGSTRÄSSER: <i>Pseudogalen in Hippocratis de Septuaginta Commentarium ab Humano, a. f., Arabice Versum</i> (Heidel).—KOCHALSKY: <i>Das Leben und die Lehre Epikurs. Diogenes Laertius Buch X</i> (Heidel).		

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University Press. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa, Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$3.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 23 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$3.23), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following publishing houses are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 13s. 3d. each; single copies, including postage, 4s. 4d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nishonbashi Tori Sanchoime, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 6.50; single copies, including postage, Yen 2.15.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 48 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$3.00, single copies, \$1.00, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 23 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, June 20, 1906, at the Post-office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of July 16, 1894.

L
v
n
a
-
4
-
9
1
5
5
6
1
9
-
e
e
e
L
le
as
e
1
o,
o,
of
e'
on
er
or

4

Classical Philology

VOLUME XII

October 1917

NUMBER 4

HORACE AND VALERIUS CATO

By G. L. HENDRICKSON

III

THE NEOTERIC POETS AND THE LATIN PURISTS

In the present study, the last of the three under my common title, I shall endeavor to draw some conclusions for the literary history of the period of transition from Catullus to the early Augustans, which seem to be indicated by the results arrived at in the two preceding papers. If it should be conceded, as I have attempted to show in the first of those papers,¹ that the initial eight lines of the tenth satire, contained in one important group of manuscripts, are not forgery or interpolation, but preserve the poet's original introduction, it will appear that Cato, whom they name, and others of his following are the target toward which the polemic of that composition was directed, both in its original and in its revised form. To point out the applicability of the criticism, which by deletion of the opening lines no longer names its goal, to Cato and his group was the object of my second paper.² In these two studies I hope to have defined, with more sharpness of outline than has before been possible, the literary background of the fourth and tenth satires, to have shown, in fact, that the elusive opponents of Horace, who are concealed behind an anonymous adversarius, opprobrious epithets and pseudonyms, and a group of real names of humbler followers, are the

¹ *Classical Philology*, XI (1916), 249 ff.

² *Ibid.*, XII (1917), 77 ff.

most important and influential group of Roman poets and critics of the time, the heirs and custodians of the poetical legacy of Catullus and Calvus. The dependence of Cato and his followers upon these two classical names is referred to satirically in the contemptuous allusion to one of Cato's satellites,

simius iste
nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum.

Whether the person here referred to be Furius Bibaculus (as I conjectured from the data preserved in Suetonius) or another does not greatly matter.¹ The main point is the connection which the phrase establishes between Cato and his school,² and Catullus and Calvus as the source of their literary inspiration.

To determine what other important literary figures of the time (in addition to Furius) can be grouped with Cato as friends or members of his circle, our record is insufficient. The only specific names afforded in connection with him (apart from his mention in Catullus) are Tigidas and Cinna, whom Suetonius cites among the admirers of Cato's poetry. But setting aside for the present such larger relationships, and confining ourselves to the group actually disclosed by our satire, it is worthy of note that Horace employs for his satirical attack the reproach which attached to the profession of teaching.³ From the sarcastic title *grammaticorum equitum doctissimus* of the initial lines, which is applied to Cato, to the contemptuous dismissal of Demetrius and Tigellius at the end,

discipularum inter iubeo plorare cathedras,

there is a tone of scorn for the environment in which Cato and his followers exercise the literary profession: they are professional teachers—Cato himself most distinguished of the gild, Demetrius and Tigellius humbler practitioners of the same art. With scornful allusion to Cato's facilities for making his poetry known Horace says,

an tua demens
vilibus in ludis dictari carmina malis?

¹ The identity of Furius with the *turgidus Alpinus* of vs. 36 is more securely attested; cf. *Classical Philology*, XII, 86.

² *Simius iste* = *simius Catonis*, since we have seen that the adversarius of l. 10 is essentially Cato. *Iste* in Horace is almost invariably a demonstrative of the second person, in accordance with the conventional grammatical teaching. It cannot, therefore, refer to Hermogenes.

³ Cf. the excursus to the first paper of this series, *Classical Philology*, XI, 267.

In arrogant contrast,

non ego: nam satis est equitem mihi plaudere.

This serves to introduce the impressive list of names with which Horace concludes, among whom none, so far as can be discerned, are to be classified in the ranks of the grammatical-pedagogical profession. It is the same antipathy to the pretensions of professional opinion and criticism which Horace later reveals:

non ego, nobilium scriptorum auditor et ultor,
grammaticas ambire tribus et pulpita dignor. [*Epp.* 1. 19. 40.]

This passage, while it shows abundant contempt and scorn, nevertheless reveals the fact that there was a strong and influential body of professional criticism (comparable perhaps to the modern literary press) which had not a little to do with the making and unmaking of contemporary literary reputations.¹ Cato had evidently enjoyed this sort of authority in full measure, and it was doubtless with reference to it that the couplet which Suetonius quotes was spoken:

Cato grammaticus, Latina Siren,
qui solus legit ac facit poetas.

For whether sincere or ironical, in any case the lines are meant to have point, and they play upon the humorous paradox of "creating poets" (ποιεῖν ποιητάς) and of "making" poetical reputations by the authority of the critic's readings.²

Horace and his friends, on the other hand, are dilettanti, under the leadership or patronage of such noble gentlemen as Maecenas, Asinius, or Messala, displaying a snobbish pride in the superior social station reflected from their patrons and in the greater rigor and purity of their stylistic tenets. To discover other lines of cleavage between these groups would be to travel outside the record, although it is a fair conjecture that Cato's circle was aligned politically rather with the opponents of Octavian's growing power. Concerning Cato himself there is no evidence, but it is recorded that Furius continued to assail Octavian with his epigrams, as he had

¹ The whole of the nineteenth letter bears upon this question, and Horace does not hesitate to acknowledge that his scorn has been a barrier to the recognition of his poetry. Cf. especially vs. 35.

² Compare in this connection what is said of the activity of Caecilius Epirota, the freedman of Atticus and friend of Gallus: "Primus Vergilium et alios poetas novos praelegere coepisse, quod etiam Domitii Marsi versiculus indicat: Epirota, tenellorum nutricula vatum" (Suet. *Gram.* 16).

assailed Julius before. Furthermore, if our Pitholeon (vs. 22) be identical with M. Voltacilius Pitholaus, as Bentley argued, it appears that his abusive epigrams against Julius Caesar, while tolerated, were not, as in the case of Catullus and Calvus, pardoned.¹

If now we look at the text of Horace alone and confess that identification of Cato in the tenth satire depends upon recognition of the authenticity of the initial eight lines, and that the presence of Furius Bibaculus is not established beyond possibility of doubt, there may be hesitation in accepting with confidence the definition of Horace's opponents which has been made. Here fortunately an independent bit of evidence comes to our aid and does much to confirm the reasonable probability (which I venture to believe has already been established) of the correctness of our conclusion. Our witness is, in fact, no other than Messala, a member and leader of the very group with which Horace is identified. We owe it to the antiquarian and philological interest of Suetonius that a brief fragment is preserved containing a judgment which runs singularly parallel to the position of Horace as we have elicited it from the study of the tenth satire. It is given merely for the sake of illustrating the usage of the word *litterator*, but in the light of the preceding argument it will be seen that it becomes a text of capital value for the whole problem of literary relationships which has been raised.

Eosdem [sc. grammaticos] litteratores vocitatos Messala Corvinus in quadam epistula ostendit, non esse sibi dicens rem cum Furio Bibaculo, ne cum Ticiida quidem, aut litteratore Catone. [*De gram.* 4.]

Curious chance that a fragment so casually preserved, in an alien context, should read so like a summary of agreement with that which we have gathered from the text of Horace! Here we find from one definitely associated with Horace and holding a position of leadership in his literary group express repudiation of the two principal figures of our tenth satire, Cato and Furius. With them is associated a third, the poet Ticiidas, whom Horace does not name, but who, as we have seen above, is quoted by Suetonius as one of the admirers of Cato's poetry. All that we know of him from other sources confirms the correctness of Messala's association of him with Cato. From Ovid

¹ For Furius see Tacitus *Ann.* 4. 34. For Pitholaus, Suet. *Jul.* 75. For the reconciliation of Caesar with Calvus and Catullus, *ibid.* 73.

and Apuleius we learn that he was an erotic elegist; the line cited by Suetonius is obviously from an encomiastic epigram; the single citation in Priscian is from an hymeneal ode (*Ticidas in Hymeneo*) which betrays the influence of Catullus.¹

That there is some community of purpose in the repudiation of the same group of poets by Horace and Messala cannot be doubted. To determine this common purpose and point of view is the problem which confronts us. The time and circumstance of Messala's utterance is unknown. *In quadam epistula*, says Suetonius, and in imagination one might (with a warning to the literal-minded!) entertain the fancy that the letter in question was Messala's acknowledgment to Horace of his vigorous satire.² Since the vogue and authority of Cato and Furius are implied (and they were already well advanced in years at the time of the tenth satire) it would not be natural to assume a later date for Messala's words.

The whole tone of Horace's composition reveals the support of a sympathetic group or clique, of which Messala is one. In defining the original constitution of this group we cannot simply take over the imposing list of names at the end of the satire, which, I feel convinced, represents the expanded circle of Horace's powerful friends at the time when the tenth satire was made the epilogue of his first book (35 B.C.). We shall get nearer to the truth of the original controversy by looking rather at the names contained within the body of the composition, which are then to be sure practically all repeated at the end. Indeed this fact of repetition is, I suspect, itself evidence of the appended character of the final names. Pursuing this course we see, first of all, that Messala Corvinus is named as an example in oratorical prose of that purity of Latin diction at which poetry should aim (vs. 29). Secondly, that in contrast with Furius Bibaculus (*turgidus Alpinus*) a list of poets and *genres* are named as exemplifying the new direction in poetry with which Horace groups his own efforts:

*turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque
diffingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo, etc.*

¹ For the testimonia concerning *Ticidas*, cf. Schanz, I, 2, p. 87.

² Quite without reason or reflection the manuals of Roman literature assign this fragment to the learned studies of Messala, as if he were discussing the usage of the word *litterator*.

Horace then names with epithets of praise Fundanius for comedy, Pollio for tragedy, Varius for epic, Virgil for pastoral, and with them associates himself modestly in satire. The principle which gives coherence to this group is doubtless friendship in the first instance and personal sympathy. But contact with such personalities as Messala, Asinius, and Varius cannot, in a time of active theoretical ferment, have been without influence upon literary principles, and we may therefore believe that Horace appeals to these names as exemplifying the principles which have been defined in this satire, partly in criticism of Lucilius and partly in contrast to Cato and his followers. While Horace, by his scorn of their defense of Greek words and by his sneers at the Latinity of Furius, implies that his opponents were careless and perverse workmen, yet we need not take him too seriously, nor can we believe that Cato, the friend of Catullus and Cinna, was one to condone loose workmanship. It is a difference of principle which is involved, and Horace magnifies slight differences to great contrasts, as is the manner in such controversies: the immediate past is always bad, but worst of all is its persistence into the present. Catullus, Calvus, Cinna, and therefore most certainly Cato and Furius as well, were proudly conscious of great advance in artistry over earlier Latin poetry; but new refinements of stylistic taste, and reactions from mannerism and excess stamped the elegance and embellishment of yesterday as crudity and fustian to be shunned today.

One clear antithesis, however, does emerge. It is the fact that, while the opposing group (exemplified in this instance only by the name of Furius) are devotees of the neo-Hellenistic school—writers of minor epics, elegy, and the epigram—the group which Horace names is seen to have a wider range and a more generous ambition. With the exception of Virgil they appear as composers of forms which reach back of Alexandrinism to the older Greek models, the Homeric epic (*forte epos*), Attic tragedy and comedy. Virgil, to be sure, in latinizing the Theocritean idyl is Alexandrine, but even he had abandoned the beaten track of elegy and epyllion. With the exception of the pastoral these are all renewals of those forms which made up the older Roman literature, the epic of Ennius, the comedy of Plautus and Terence, the tragedy of Accius, the Lucilian satire.

Such considerations may lead to the thought that one of the principles of coherence of the group is a sort of patriotic renewal of the older classical literature of Rome, in a form suited to the severer standards of a new age; not to follow in the track of the popular neo-Hellenism, but to produce a literature in language and spirit thoroughly Latin, though drawing its inspiration and, where necessary, its material from Greek models. It is not too much to see some hint of this nationalistic spirit in that passage of our satire which ridicules the praise of Greek words in Latin, and which leads up to the enumeration of the poets and literary forms under consideration. Certainly something of patriotic appeal is intended by such lines as

scilicet oblitus patriae patrisque Latini,¹

and

atque ego cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra,
versiculos, vetuit me tali voce Quirinus.

But these are merely hints and suggestions which provoke the idea. The truth of this interpretation cannot be established by external evidence or direct affirmation; it must be established, if at all, by an examination of the actual work of the two schools, supplemented here and there by such theoretical utterances as our meager record preserves.

Horace's boyhood and awakening literary sense fell in the time just subsequent to the death of Catullus. The old standards of literary values still prevailed in the school of Orbilius and were maintained with stern discipline against the intoxication of the "new poetry." But, while the sweet liquor of the new Hellenism was drunk eagerly by the rising age, men of the generation of Orbilius, Cicero, and Varro clung tenaciously to the old. To them the old Latin poetry was already a classical unit, set off from the present by nearly half a century from the death of Lucilius and Accius. Horace himself in the letter to Augustus gives the most complete

¹ I take the opportunity of allusion to this line to add a word of explanation concerning *patrisque Latini*. Latinus does not, to be sure, appear elsewhere as the ancestor of the Roman people in a political or social sense (like Romulus or Quirinus). But as the ultimate ancestor of the *Latin-speaking* race he is named in similar manner by Varro, *L.L.* 5. 9: "non enim videbatur consentaneum quaerere me in eo verbo quod finxisset Ennius causam, negligere quod ante *rex Latinus* finxisset."

expression of the obstinate, unreasoning esteem in which this literature was held, although it is difficult to say whether his account refers to conditions of his youth or to some recrudescence of the older admiration at the time of his writing (17 B.C.):

(Roma) habet hos numeratque poetas
ad nostrum tempus Livi scriptoris ab aevo.

The truth of this somewhat ironical account of Roman literary taste, at least for the time of Cicero and Varro, admits of abundant confirmation. A brief survey of the places and contexts in which the larger fragments of Ennius and Accius are found is sufficient evidence.¹ For Cicero it is scarcely too much to say that Greek tragedy, for example, exists for him essentially in the versions of Ennius and Accius. Greek philosophers and orators may perhaps be read most naturally in Greek, but to prefer Euripides and Sophocles to the Roman tragedians is an intolerable mark of sloth or of affected disdain (*De fin.* i. 2. 4 and i. 3. 7). It is plain that Cicero is arguing the old Roman cause against a rising tide of opposition (*Opt. gen. orat.* 6. 18), but certainly not without much sympathy and success, as Varro and Horace show. To Cicero these men are not mere translators, but poets in their own right, *qui non verba, sed vim Graecorum expresserunt poetarum* (*Acad.* i. 3. 10). Something of Roman quality and personality has passed into their renderings, and has resulted in a Roman literature to be looked upon, not as a mere counterpart to Greek in Latin words, but as a true successor, strong in its own right. Some such conception of the independent value of early Roman poetry was entertained by its defenders, the truth of which the investigations of recent years have tended to confirm. We owe it to the penetrating and sympathetic scholarship of Leo that this point of view has at length found adequate and enduring expression.²

In the diction of this earlier Roman poetry we pass quickly from the easy colloquial employment of Greek words in Plautus to the conscious purism of Ennius, which became, in fact, a norm of usage for subsequent Latin poetry. As time went on it was inevitable

¹ See especially the admirable survey in Vahlen's *Ennius*. The passages from Cicero form an entertaining anthology of comment and criticism (p. xxxix ff.).

² *Geschichte der röm. Literatur*, Vol. I (1913), *passim*.

that some new words should be adopted from the Greek, but the fragments of Accius show few additions to the Greek words which have been fixed in the language from Plautus' time. Afranius, as befits the writer of the *togata*, is rigorous in exclusion. Afranius is indeed a very characteristic figure of the growing tendency of Roman literature toward a larger independence than either Ennius or Accius had employed. To be sure, in the actual practice of tragical composition Accius would seem to have exercised a freedom toward his originals not very different from the complete independence which the *togata* afforded to Afranius. But whereas Accius abode by the tradition of producing plays upon Greek originals, Afranius undertook to dramatize Roman life and manners in Roman costume. He professed freely his indebtedness to Menander, but this does not differ from his indebtedness to Terence and others, whether Greek or Latin, as he says in a well-known fragment. Even Lucilius, with his excessive blending of Greek and Latin words, is not really an exception to the general rule of the increasing severity of Roman standards of pure Latinity for serious literature. What Lucilius gives us when he uses Greek is the literary reproduction of familiar conversation, either playful or technical. Where his treatment is serious or earnest (as Leo notes) his speech is pure Latin. The essential analogue to Lucilius in the use of Greek is Cicero in his familiar letters, for whom in the orations another language than Latin scarcely exists. The vigor and self-consciousness of the movement toward the exclusion of Greek and the establishment of an independent Roman literature may be seen most sharply in some of its excesses, as, for example, in the naïve arrogance of the *Auctor ad Herennium*. Though everywhere his examples and precepts are drawn from Greek writers, yet the name of no Greek author is anywhere found in his pages (Marx, p. 115); Cato, Crassus, and Ennius do service for Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Homer; a few Greek technical terms occur, but nearly always with a Latin interpretation. To this same general tendency belongs Lucretius, not with narrow purism, yet with clearly recognizable intention. For, though he laments the *patrii sermonis egestas*, yet only rarely does he go boldly afield to expand the resources of expression by borrowed Greek. Though he knows the trick of the sensuous Greek line and uses it

occasionally for special effects,¹ yet on the whole he belongs emphatically in the national tradition of Latin for the Romans, as inaugurated by Ennius.

In contrast to this earlier compact tradition of Roman classicism and Latin purity there grew up gradually a new cult of Greek imitation in Latin poetry, which derived its nourishment, not from the old Attic and Ionic models, but from contemporary Greek poetry as it was cultivated in Alexandria and in the cities of Asia Minor. The beginnings of this imitation seized first upon the lighter forms, such as erotic epigrams and trifles, which are discernible in the Lucilian satires and in the few specimens preserved from Catullus, Porcius Licinus, etc. The first striking representative of this type of poetry is Laevius, the fragments of whose *Erotopaegnia* are preserved in considerable number. Here, for the first time in Latin poetry, we catch vaguely the aroma of that new theme in the world's literature, which was destined ultimately to become its largest factor, namely, sentimental, romantic love. Titles like *Alcestis*, *Adonis*, *Helena*, *Protesilaudamia*, *Sirenocirca*, reveal how the figures of the old mythology were being worked over from a new point of view, which already anticipates the treatment familiar to us from the pages of Ovid. The stylistic tone is sentimental, marked by diminutives, bold compounds, and Greek words new to Latin usage, and, though in excess, its kinship with the manner of Catullus is already discernible. It cannot be doubted that Laevius is an important precursor of that school of which Cicero presently speaks contemptuously as the *νεώτεροι*. That this conception of the place of Laevius was entertained in antiquity is clear from Gellius, who places Laevius at the beginning of a series which is continued with the names of Catullus, Calvus, Hortensius, Cinna, Memmius.²

The essential respect in which all this group stands in sharp contrast with the older classical Latin poetry is its attitude toward

¹ Cf. 2. 410 (on the atomic constitution of sounds):
ne tu forte putes serrae stridentis acerbum
horrorem constare elementis levibus aequae
ac musaeae mele, per chordas organici quae
mobilibus digitis expergefata figurant.

The contrast with the preceding line is the special effect aimed at.

² Gellius 19. 9. 7: "nisi Catullus forte pauca et Calvus itidem pauca; nam Laevius implicata et Hortensius invenusta et Cinna inlepidia et Memmius dura, ac deinceps omnes rudia fecerunt atque absona."

Greek. Whereas the older poetry had sought to assimilate Greek ideas and Greek forms, and out of these elements, in new and free combination, to create a national Roman literature, self-sufficient and independent, this new school took quite the opposite direction, and with contempt of older Roman performance endeavored to bring boldly into Roman poetry the graces and vocabulary of Greek itself. It is not too much to call the new poets of deliberate and set purpose *graecissantes*.

To collect the evidence for this opinion with any degree of thoroughness would require much more space than is available, and it would be superfluous, since isolated studies already exist which have done a great part of the necessary work. One point must be kept in mind, namely, that Catullus is for us the first representative of this stylistic tendency whose work is preserved with sufficient fulness to afford an adequate basis of judgment. While it is perhaps true that certain Grecizing tendencies are not more conspicuously illustrated in his work than by later authors, such as Propertius and Ovid, yet we must not overlook the fact that Catullus is much earlier in point of time, and that the effect of his Grecisms must have been much more striking and exotic than similar boldness of a later time, which had lost the shock of novelty.

To make a mere catalogue of the Grecizing tendencies of Catullus is no easy matter. They consist in the choice of literary forms, in the sentimental and romantic treatment of mythological themes (*Ariadne*, *Laodamia*), in translations and adaptations of material which must have seemed as bizarre and exotic to the generation of Cicero as they seem to us (*Coma Berenices*, *Attis*). Coming to details of technique we find that they consist in Grecisms of forms and inflections of proper names, in the general use of Greek words and Greek inflections¹ with a freedom unknown to serious Latin poetry before his time (unless in Laevius), in the ornamental employment of Greek geographical and mythological names, in the affectation of a soft vocalism made up of Greek elements, in mannerisms of versification like the favorite spondaic termination (which Cicero

¹ Cf. Sniehotta, *De vocum Graecarum . . . usu* (Breslauer Abhdlg., ix, 1903, a careful and valuable study by a pupil of Norden), p. 63: "inveniuntur igitur in Catulli carminibus terminationes Graecae, quae ab omnibus qui ante eum versus pepigerunt, multisque eorum qui secuti sunt, alienae erant."

ridicules) or the filling out of half a line with a single word, in the reintroduction (for Roman taste had already repudiated it) of Latin compounds made in imitation of the Greek. The list could be increased and should embrace both syntactical and stylistic imitations, some of which can be definitely traced, while others in the loss of corresponding Greek literature can only be felt. But it is not necessary to labor the point. Students of Catullus will be able to furnish examples for all of the categories named and for others that I have omitted. That the work of Catullus, therefore, and of the school which he represents, displays a well-defined, deliberate, Grecizing tendency, looking toward sweetness and sensuousness of poetical effect, is a conclusion which I imagine will be generally granted, nor do I urge it as a novel point of view.¹ Their art came to be recognized as the *dolce stil nuovo* of Latin poetry. Its novelty was felt in the contrast which it presented to that which was held in highest esteem by Romans of the time and, according to age and taste, it was praised or blamed. *O poetam egregium* (Cicero writes of Ennius in words often quoted), *quamquam ab his cantoribus Euphronis contemnitur*.² For us it is enough to set side by side with one of the longer poems of Catullus a corresponding passage of Lucretius (in lieu of Ennius) to feel the contrast much as Cicero felt it.

But not only in Catullus are these traits of Greek adaptation strongly marked. The *Ciris*, for example (whether it be considered a juvenile effort of Virgil, the work of Gallus, or, in accordance with Sudhaus' theory, an anonymous cento of neoteric imitation), is apparently a most typical example of the epyllion, as cultivated by those who felt the double influence of Hellenistic models and Roman predecessors. Beyond any extant work of similar compass it displays a *color Graecus* such as was characteristic of the whole type.³ Worth

¹ Cf. Norden, *Einl. in d. Altertumswissenschaft*, I, 477: "Die lateinische Literatursprache ist in keiner Phase ihrer Existenz mehr in Gefahr gewesen, ihre *potentia* der griechischen *gratia* aufzuopfern."

² Cf. Sniehotta, *op. cit.*, p. 63: "Hi poetae quibus *νεώτεροι* nomen datum est, a Cicerone saepius reprehensi sunt, quod novum genus in poesin introducerent nimis graecissantes."

³ See especially Ganzenmüller, *Jhbb. Supl.* XX, 639, with interesting details, and Skutsch, *Gallus u. Vergil*, p. 95. For its general traits and relation to Catullus, Cinna, and Calvus see Sudhaus, *Hermes*, XLII (1907), 469 ff., and summary, p. 504.

quoting is the stylistic characterization which the author gives of his work:

quamvis interdum ludere nobis
et gracilem molli liceat pede claudere versum, [19-20]

which might pass as a formulation of creed for all of this neo-Hellenistic group. The Grecizing traits are much the same as those enumerated above for Catullus, except for the use of compound words. In the free use of Greek words other than proper names it even surpasses Catullus, and probably indeed any other comparable product of Roman poetry. Whatever its authorship and the explanation of the puzzling problems of relationship which it presents, it is a typical product of the school of poetry which, after the death of Catullus and Calvus and Cinna, still enjoyed vigorous life and counted among its leaders Valerius Cato.

That the use of Greek in the colloquial jargon of Lucilius and in the highly flavored verses of elegy and epyllion is a very different and almost unrelated phenomenon did not apparently prevent Cato or his pupils from grouping the two things together:

sermo lingua concinnus utraque
suavior, ut Chio nota si commixta Falerni est.

This has been thought of as a scarcely serious or sincere argument, invented by Horace. But not so. It is the same point of view which we find specifically enunciated by so competent a theorist as Quintilian, and rests upon the persuasion which Quintilian develops at length—that the sound of Greek was far more pleasing and musical than that of Latin. To this subject a considerable section is devoted in the twelfth book (10. 27-34), which in this connection makes interesting reading. It concludes: *itaque tanto est sermo Graecus Latino iucundior, ut nostri poetae, quotiens dulce carmen esse voluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornent*. This belief, to which Horace alludes with briefer phrase (*suavior*), is doubtless a very inadequate justification for Lucilius' Greek, but it is the kind of a defense that might be expected from Horace's opponents, for it is of the very essence of the neoteric creed of style. In their use of Greek proper names of persons or places there is, to be sure, an associative value with myth and story, which may be thought of as independent of sound, but for the most part such names are sought

as yield a vocalism little impeded by consonants and of a soft and pleasing rhythm. Examples (drawn from Catullus) like *Amphytroniades*, *Protesilaeam*, or *Androgeoneae*, each of which fills out half a line,¹ are only extreme instances of a tendency which is equally shown by many shorter words, *Aeetaeos*, *Penelopeo*, *Aganippe*, *Larissaea*, *Nereine*, *Minois*, *Booten*, *Itoni*, and the favorite *Eoa*. Such words gave a vocalic quality to the verse which the ancient critics recognized by a special name, *versus vocales, qui alte producta elocutione sonantibus litteris universam dictionem inlustrant*.² To illustrate by one or two whole lines:

lympaque in Oetaeis Malia Thermopylis [68. 54],

or most extreme of all in exotic effect,

proximus Hydrochoi fulget Oarion [66. 94].

Catullus is more sparing in his use of Greek appellatives, but a similar tendency is discernible here. *Leoni* and *leonibus* will do for the inflected forms, but the more sonorous *leaena* takes the place of *leo*; *lympa* has all but banished *aqua*; a large number of rather highly colored nouns, foreign to Latin up to this time, are to be found, such as *barathrum*, *bombus*, *calathiscus*, *crocinus*, *hyacinthus*, *mitra*, *parthenice*, *strophium*, *thiasus*, *thyrsus*, etc.³

The reaction from the excessive Grecism of the neoteric school—its daintiness and sweetness—began, as I believe, with Messala and Varius and Horace, just at the time with which we are dealing. But it was still a live question in the time of Persius, and constitutes part of the theme of the first satire. Ridiculing the effeminate literary ambitions of the day, the satirist gives some specimens of the kind of poetry which reveals Roman degeneracy from the sounder taste of an earlier age. The examples are characterized by Greek words and names, and are of the same type as the verses of Catullus,

¹ The employment of words containing two or more metrical feet is to be avoided in *clausula*, Quint. (9. 4. 64) teaches, and adds significantly for our argument: "quod etiam in carminibus est *permolle*."

² Diomedes, *G.L.*, I, p. 499 (extr.), with an example of which I cite the first line: "Eoo Oceano Hyperion fulgurat Euro."

³ Cf. Ellis, *Com.*, xxxi, and Baehrens, *Proleg.*, 46, for fuller (but not complete) list, which would contain a great many colloquial words irrelevant to this context. An actual statistic of Greek words in the *Ciris*, which is somewhat more extreme than Catullus, is given by Ganzemüller, *op. cit.*, p. 640, and amounts to 11 per cent of all words used.

and the *Ciris*, which we have been considering: *Berecynthius Attis; dirimebat nerea delphin; torva Mimalloneis implerunt cornua bombis* (which reads like a parody of Catullus 64. 263, *multis raucisonos efflabant cornua bombos*). *Arma virum* (he continues)—“by the sacred shade of Virgil! is not this the veriest drivel, and lighter than cork”? And then after some other examples: “could this thing be if there survived within us a particle of our father’s manhood”? The scholiast comments: *non sunt Persii, sed poetae nescio cuius graecis-santis . . . sic robur Latinae eviravimus linguae intermiscendo Graecas glossulas*. Cf. also schol. ad vs. 103. In the same general direction of satire is a familiar passage of Juvenal (3. 60 ff.):

non possum ferre Quirites
Graecam urbem.
• • • • •
Rusticus ille tuus sumit trechedipna, Quirine,
et ceromatico fert niceteria collo.

The humor—and satire—of the last line lies in the parody of the Grecizing poetical manner, its softness and effeminacy contrasting with the ancient tradition of Roman virility.¹

Juvenal's appeal to Quirinus may take us back again to Horace (*vetuit me tali voce Quirinus*). It is plain, I think, that Horace's plea for pure Latin is not wholly a matter of stylistic principle; he entertains a certain national pride in the matter—that Romans should make it a point of scruple and conscience to preserve the integrity of Roman speech. His words are addressed in the first instance to the criticism of Lucilius, but their ultimate goal is those who in his own time were perverting Latin poetry by Greek words and Greek stylistic fashions. It would seem too that Horace raises protest against the whole habit of literary trifling with the lighter Greek forms—*versiculos Graecos*—an accomplishment which already belonged to the education of a Roman gentleman, as in the time of Persius (i. 70), *nugari solitos Graece*. The vogue of such literary activity is apparent, not only from Catullus and those whom his pages reflect, but from such collections as the Virgilian *Catalepta*, and the epigrams of

¹ Cf. Quint. i. 5. 39 (on Greek inflections): "ac si reperias grammaticum veterum amatorem, neget quidquam ex Latina ratione mutandum . . . quin etiam laudet virtutem eorum, qui potentiores facere linguam Latinam studebant nec alienis egere institutis fatabantur." Cf. also Juv. 6. 188 ff.

Furius quoted by Suetonius. That Horace was not alone in his hostility has already been implied. In fact, it is rather to be assumed that Horace was the recipient of doctrines of Latin purity which had come to him through the medium of Asinius and Messala from the purists of the Ciceronian time, Caesar, Calvus, Brutus, and others. The creed was originally applied to oratory and prose. It can scarcely have been thought of in Catullus' day as applicable to poetry. (Was the *Io* of Calvus executed in the spirit of the *Attis*, the *Peleus and Thetis*, and the *Allius* elegy? Most probably, yes; but, if so, it is clear that Calvus left his Atticism in the forum and did not fear the reproach of inconsistency.) Of the zeal of Messala, devoted to the attainment and inculcation of a pure Latinity, a slight survey of the testimonia in Meyer's *Fragmenta* (p. 507²) is sufficient evidence: *fuit Messala exactissimi ingeni in omni studiorum parte, Latini utique sermonis observator diligentissimus.* (Seneca, *Cont.* 2. 4. 8). These words do not refer merely to avoidance of Greek (as is commonly interpreted), but to all the niceties of usage in the choice of Latin words with reference to form and meaning which constituted *Latinitas*. Not many examples of Messala's practice and teaching in this regard have come down to us,¹ but they are sufficient to reveal a tendency which, in his case as well as in Pollio's, may have descended to a pedantic preciousness.

The corresponding studies of Asinius Pollio are better attested, but I will refer to only one example, since it touches Catullus. For it appears that a special monograph had been devoted to Catullus, which is quoted by Charisius as *Asinius in Valerium*.² The fragment cited lays down the rule that *pugillares* is always plural and masculine, whereas Catullus (42. 5) uses *pugillaria*. The observation is slight; it is only a straw, but it serves to show the direction of the wind. A breath of pedantry? Perhaps. But consider how trivial a century hence the question of "point of view" or "view-point" (which now makes your flesh creep) will seem. What other things in Catullus Asinius found to criticize cannot be determined, but one conjecture may be permitted. His satire of the language

¹ See the examples in Funaioli, p. 505: *Gladiola, cognomentum, duapondo, reatum*, etc. Quintilian speaks of whole books devoted to single letters (i. 7. 35), which may be merely a generalization of the *liber de S littera* (*ibid.* 23).

² Funaioli, p. 499.

or speech of Livy as *Patavinitas* is notorious. With a similar touch of contempt for the provincialism of the same region, someone is author of the remark, which Quintilian quotes, that *Catullus "ploxe-num" circa Padum invenit* (1. 5. 8). Was it perhaps Asinius?

Rome, for all that it was sterile and unproductive of literary genius, laid claim to the dictatorship of Latin speech.¹ It was difficult and probably impossible for the non-Roman to meet all the refinements of usage and tradition which, to city-born purists like Asinius and Messala, constituted the essentials of good Latin. Messala's slighting comment on the famous Spanish declaimer, Porcius Latro—*sua lingua disertus*, "eloquent, yes; but in his own language"—is sharp but probably typical of the whole attitude of such purists. There must, in fact, have been much in the language of this brilliant group of poets from Northern Italy and Gaul which, to ears so fastidious, was open to the charge of provincialism and defective Latinity.² Horace perhaps escaped by virtue of a childhood spent at Rome, and was not, therefore, afraid to throw stones at Furius for "murdering Memnon." Cato himself Horace does not attack directly on this score, though he strives to implicate him in the general charge by ridiculing the praise which had been bestowed upon Lucilius for elegance of style (*limatior*). Virgil, in spite of the praise of Horace's group, did not escape, and his provincial origin afforded a handle for ill-natured parody which was elicited by his earliest work (*prolatis Bucolicis Numitorius quidam rescripsit Antibucolica*):

dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecus? anne Latinum?
Non, verum Aegonis; nostri sic rure loquuntur.³

¹ It was probably due to the influence and claims of the scholars of this period that Roman usage became fixed as the norm of pure Latinity. "Latinitas est incorrupta loquendi observatio secundum Romanam linguam" (Dion., p. 439). The definition is commonly attributed to Varro (Wilmanns and Funaioli). But Varro protests (*R.R.* i. 2. 1) against the innovations of *hi recentes urbani* in more than one place. It is probable that he would have preferred rather the older definition, which is found in the *Auct. ad Her.* 4. 17: "sermo purus ab omni vitio remotus." Quintilian, too, at a later time is more generous: "licet omnia Italica pro Romanis habeam" (1. 5. 56), though his words show that the definition *secundum Romanam linguam* still prevailed.

² Cf. Cic. *Brutus* 171: "cum in Galliam veneris, audies verba quaedam non trita Romae; illud est maius quod in vocibus nostrorum oratorum retinnit quiddam et resonat urbanus."

³ Cf. Macrobius 5. 2. 1: "unde enim Veneto rusticis parentibus nato inter silvas et frutices educto vel levis Graecarum notitia litterarum."

But the special manifestation of this purism with which we are now concerned is the avoidance of Greek words in Latin. For Messala the direct evidence is perhaps no more than the scholia on vs. 29, which in several different versions report his painstaking observance of this rule, and cite his revival of *funambulus* (from Terence) for the customary and colloquial *σχοινοβάτης*. A similar tendency may be observed in the fragment, cited above (p. 332), in which he speaks of *litteratore Catone* with manifest avoidance of the current and technical name *grammatico*. Equally significant is the inference which may be drawn from the reported attitude of Tiberius, and its relation to the teaching and practice of Messala:

In oratione Latina secutus est Corvinum Messalam . . . Sermone Graeco, quamquam alioqui promptus et facilis, non tamen usque quaque usus est, abstinuitque maxime in senatu; adeo quidem, ut *monopolium* nominaturus veniam prius postularet quod sibi verbo peregrino utendum esset. [Suet. *Tib.* 70 and 71, with other examples.]

But this rigor did not, of course, signify antipathy to Greek as such; for, just as we know that Messala admired and translated Hyperides, so Tiberius was especially devoted to the Greek *νέωτεροι*, Euphoriion, Rhianus, and Parthenius. But Latin must be pure, and not only free from alien words, but scrupulously correct in the use of Latin words themselves, in accordance with the niceties of diction laid down by the Roman *précieux*: *adfectione et morositate nimia obscurabat stilum* (*ibid.* 70), a judgment which recalls Cicero's verdict on the meticulous purity of Calvus.¹

Still one other witness to the ban upon Greek words may be adduced from this literary circle, L. Varius, the friend and literary executor of Virgil, whose pre-eminence in epic Horace recognizes in this same satire (vs. 43): *forte epos* (perhaps in contrast to the fashionable *epyllion*) *ut nemo ducit*. The evidence for his position is slight but certain. It is contained in one of the epigrams of the Virgilian *Catalepta*:

Scilicet, hoc sine fraude, Vari dulcissime, dicam:
dispeream nisi me perdidit iste pothos.
sin autem praecepta vetant me dicere, sane
non dicam, sed me perdidit iste puer. [7.]

¹ *Brutus* 283: "nimium inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans metuensque ne vitiosum colligeret, etiam verum sanguinem deperdebat."

The point of the lines consists, not in their erotic content, but in Virgil's banter of Varius for his stern *praecepta* (*Latinitatis*).¹ One might suspect that Virgil had already written the second line as it stands here; on being taken to task for the concluding word, he replied with this epigram. But was he convinced? Scarcely; the substitution sounds like an effort to ruin by parody a line which derives what poetry there is in it from the Greek word. Nor did Virgil remain a convert to the new doctrine; Greek words continued to be ready at hand for him whenever they suited the effect at which he aimed, and drew upon him the same sort of criticism which Horace here directs against Lucilius and his champion.²

Although Virgil is included among the poets of the new age whom Horace arrays against the neoteric school of Cato, yet by origin he is a disciple of Catullus and the Alexandrines. His indebtedness to Catullus is most marked in the short poems of the *Catalepta*,³ but from the same sources of inspiration he has learned that sweetness and daintiness of style which is so often found in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Not infrequently this quality depends essentially upon a delicate use of Greek words and names, as in *Ecl.* 7. 37:

Nerine Galatea, thymo mihi dulcior Hyblae,
candidior cyenis, edera formosior alba.

The spell which the melody of Greek names exercised upon Virgil is nicely illustrated also by a line of the *Georgics*, which Gellius quotes with interesting comment:

Glaucō et Panopeae et Inoo Melicertae [l. 437].

The verse is imitated from Parthenius (he says) with slight but pleasing change—*duobus vocabulis venuste immutatis*. Not so successful is an example of adaptation from Homer, for the verse of Homer is *simplicior et sincerior*, *Vergilii autem νεωτερικώτερος*—a noteworthy bit of criticism, with acute apprehension of the Virgilian manner and its *provenance*. Even the *Aeneid* is not free from this exuberant

¹ For the reading *pothos* (MSS, *pothus*) see Birt, *Jugendverse Vergils*, p. 82, and commentary.

² Cf. Macrobius (1. 24. 7), who draws from early sources the matter which he puts into the mouths of his interlocutors: "vel si mille alia multum pudenda seu in verbis modo Graecis modo barbaris seu in ipsa dispositione operis deprehenderentur." *Id.* 6. 4. 17: "inseruit operi suo et Graeca verba."

³ See Birt's Commentary, *passim*.

toying with the music of Greek names: 2. 262, *Acamasque Thoasque*; 5. 825, *Melite Panopeaque virgo*; 826, *Thaliaque Cymodoceque*; 6. 480, *Parthenopaeus* It. *Adrasti*; 483 *Medontaque Thersilochumque* (cf. whole context of these passages). But on the whole, in spite of Greek names and inflections, its verse is more vigorous and severe than either of the earlier works. Virgil had in the meantime learned to recognize an austere beauty in the verse of Ennius, which as a younger man he had not felt.¹

The banishment of Greek words from oratorical prose had long been effected. The earlier tendencies of Latin poetry from Ennius on had been in the same direction. But Alexandrine and contemporary Greek influences of the first half of the first century had resulted in a sudden Grecizing of poetry in a great variety of ways, which threatened to overwhelm and engulf the older national traditions. The movement of reaction we find represented, so far as the employment of Greek words is concerned, by three names, all of which are represented in our satire—Varius, Messala, and Horace. How much else of common literary program this group shared is not so easy to determine. But as avoidance of Greek is only one aspect of stylistic purity, so it appears that they took upon themselves the special defense of faultless Latinity, under the leadership of Messala and Asinius, masters of prose. The simplification of the poetical period (which in Catullus' longer poems and in the *Ciris* is still long and unwieldy) may be looked upon most naturally as a manifestation of the same efforts which were being directed toward the simplification of the Latin prose sentence. The prose of Roman Atticism is unfortunately lost, but we may catch some hint of its quality, I imagine, from the satires of Horace. It is an interesting nor wholly idle pastime to take one of the Horatian satires (like i. 9, for example) and read it as nearly as possible free from the trammels of verse, in accordance with the poet's own suggestion—*eripias si tempora certa modosque, etc.*

The most essential stylistic principle which Horace affords is set forth primarily for the writing of satire; but it will be recognized also as the rule which governed his whole stylistic practice: *sermone opus*

¹ Cf. Seneca *ap. Gell.* 12. 2. 10: "Vergilius quoque noster non ex alia causa duos quosdam versus et enormes et aliquid supra mensuram trahentis interposuit quam ut Ennianus populus agnosceret in novo carmine aliquid antiquitatis." See Norden's recent book, *Ennius u. Vergil*, Leipzig, 1915, especially p. 153 ff.

est defendente vicem urbani, parcentis viribus atque extenuantis eas consulto—that is, refinement and restraint. It is scarcely necessary to illustrate this principle by other utterances from Horace, which could be adduced in abundance. Let it suffice to cite merely the injunction laid down in the *Art of Poetry* with regard to the choice of words and their joining:

in verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis,
hoc amet, hoc spernat promissi carminis auctor. [46.]

For Messala our evidence is of the same kind: painstaking in the choice of words—in *verbis magis elaboratus* (quam Cicero), as Tacitus says (*Dial.* 18), elegant (*nitidus*), clear, and pure (*candidus*), in his translations from the Greek vying with Hyperides in *illa difficillima Romanis subtilitate* (Quint. 10. 1. 113 and 5. 2). A hint of his restraint and fondness for too little rather than too much is contained in the characteristic anecdote of Seneca Rhetor apropos of *Aeneid* 11. 290: *Messala aiebat hic* [i.e., after *haesit*] *Vergilium debuisse desinere: quod sequitur explementum est* (*Suas.* 2. 20).¹

It has been said above that the literary work of the poets whom Horace names shows a return to forms which had been cultivated by the older Roman poetry. They were, to be sure, without doubt like Horace himself hostile to the crude workmanship of that older poetry, but their effort was apparently to re-create those substantial forms in a finish and perfection of style which should correspond to the demands of the newer time. In this direction Virgil also worked at a later time with his *Aeneid* (if indeed his *Georgics* do not belong in this category), giving to the Romans a national epic embodying the spirit and Roman dignity of the *Annales*, but executed with an art and stylistic form incomparably more perfect. Something of the same sort could be said of Livy's *History*, which in spirit and purpose does not rise above the older Roman annalists, however much it surpasses them in eloquence and literary form.²

¹ Just as the style of Calvus seemed to Cicero lacking in vigor (*verum sanguinem deperdebat*, *Brut.* 283; *vis non erat*, *Ad fam.* 15. 21), so Quintilian speaks of Messala as *viribus minor* (10. 1. 113). Horace did not escape the same censure: "*sine nervis altera quidquid composui pars esse putat*." It is the critical counterpart of his own creed, *parcentis viribus*.

² Cf. Norden, *Aen.* vi, p. 361: "Jene eigenthümliche Mischung von Altem mit Neuem, die ein hervorstechendes Kennzeichen der augusteischen Aera ist," etc. I have indicated elsewhere that the studies of the Roman purists, like the Greek Atticists, were archaistic in tendency (cf. "The *de Analogia* of Julius Caesar," *Classical Philology*, I, 101).

The antithesis which I have endeavored to point out between Horace and his friends on the one side, and the school of Cato and Furius on the other, may be traced somewhat further into the Augustan age. For convenience, and without aiming to make rigid categories, we may call the one group Roman or nationalistic, the other Grecizing or Hellenistic. To the former we may now add Tibullus, who, although he uses the elegy, a Hellenistic form, nevertheless deserves to rank as perhaps the most purely Roman of all Latin poets. In literary affiliation he is the friend and client of Messala, a circumstance which justifies the belief that in no small degree he owes to the influence of his patron's principles that careful erasure and elimination of everything that would reveal Greek models or Greek sources of literary influence. In the use of Greek words, Greek proper names, and Greek inflections he is the most sparing of all Roman poets. It was obviously his aim and purpose to create the impression of a Roman poetry native and untouched by foreign models. That which is here said of Tibullus applies equally to the Lygdamus and Sulpicia elegies of the *Corpus Tibullianum*. Propertius, on the other hand, avows fully and frankly his indebtedness to Greek influences, and in the use of Greek words and Greek inflections, in the whole color of his work, is perhaps most frankly Greek of all the poets of the Augustan age.¹ It is not my purpose to pursue this theme further at the present time. It is a subject so large and so dependent for interest upon illustrative details that to touch it merely in passing is futile and open to the danger of loose generalization, the curse of literary history. I venture, however, to add Ovid to the sequence of the Grecizing poets, but with the qualification that his singular formal talent has accommodated Greek technique to Latin speech with such flexible and plastic art that it is scarcely felt any longer as foreign.²

NEW HAVEN

¹ For Tibullus and Propertius cf. Leo in *Kultur d. Gegenwart*, p. 449 (3d ed.). For the purism of Tibullus see the very interesting study of R. Bürger, "Beiträge zur Elegancia Tibullus," in the volume in honor of Leo, *Xáμρες*, Berlin, 1911.

² I feel that an explanation is due to the readers of this journal for not having taken account of Professor Ullman's acute and suggestive study, in *Classical Philology*, X (1915), entitled "Horace, Catullus, and Tigellius." The truth is that our conceptions of the literary relations between Horace and the neoteric school are so radically at variance that incidental criticism seemed futile, while, obviously, thoroughgoing examination of his position was impossible. It seemed best, therefore, at the present time to confine myself to the positive presentation of my own point of view, reserving criticism for another time.

ETHNOLOGY AND THE GOLDEN AGE

BY GEORGE NORLIN

It is the common habit of civilized peoples to assume that the fabric of their customs and institutions represents a departure from a primitive condition or state of nature, and to estimate the value and direction of their mode of life by the contrasts which it presents to the days of long ago. But the picture which is drawn of this state of nature is itself colored in no small degree by the prejudices of the moment either for or against present conditions and tendencies. Those who are intoxicated by the wine of their achievements are prone to think of the natural state as the negation of all the good things which man has won for himself in the course of an ever-forward march, while those who have grown oversensitive to the evils of civilization dream of a lost paradise or a golden age.

But in seeking to understand these antithetical points of view we have to reckon with something more than subjective mood or fancy. Culture theorists of the more sober sort have usually sought some basis of historical reality, some solid ground of fact; assuming that in distant parts of the world, far removed from the currents of civilization, people remain very much now as they were in the beginning,¹ they have commonly taken as their point of departure, in tracing the course of human development, facts or reported facts about far-away primitive tribes. Professor J. L. Myers in a recent pamphlet² has presented a careful study of the influence of ethnology on modern political science, proving, especially for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, that there is a very close relation between the shifting ideas of that period as to the origin and growth of society and the ever-increasing store of information about uncivilized peoples which was opened up by exploration of remote regions of the earth, especially

¹ As Vilhjálmur Stefánson assumes that he found among the Dolphin and Union Straits Eskimos the conditions of the Stone Age: "My Quest in the Arctic," *Harper's Magazine*, CXXVI, 512.

² *The Influence of Anthropology on the Course of Political Science*, University of California Press, February, 1916.

the Americas. The first accounts of primitive life, derived from discoverers who brought to these aborigines "not peace but a sword,"¹ led to the view of man in his natural state which we see in Shakespeare's Caliban and Hobbes's wretched creature "poor, nasty, and brutish, in continual feare and danger of violent death"—a conception which held the boards until the Jesuit Fathers, approaching the Indians as human beings like themselves, and not seldom meeting with response of docile affection and loyalty, began in their letters home to contrast the simple virtues of these children of nature with the vices of European civilization, and so prepared the way for the ideal savage of Pope and Rousseau.²

We have here, if I am not mistaken, an instructive parallel to the influences which determined the course of *Culturgeschichte* in ancient Greece. When the Hellenes established the outposts of their civilization among the hostile tribes which bordered the Mediterranean, and especially on the coasts of what they at first called the Unfriendly Sea, they must have seen in the savage life which opposed and threatened them mainly the dark obverse of their own brighter culture.³ Their tales of cave-dwelling, man-eating monsters reflect something of this early experience;⁴ and as late as Herodotus we find the tendency to dwell, by way of contrast, on the savage customs of the un-Greek world,⁵ notably of the northern barbarians.⁶ It was inevitable that the Greeks should think of such revolting practices as human sacrifice and cannibalism which they found still existing among uncivilized peoples⁷ as survivals from a primitive condition which they in their forward progress had left behind them, and that they should look on Hellenism, especially in the years before the

¹ Myers, p. 2.

² Lavissee, *Hist. de France*, VIII, 2 Partie, p. 308: "Avant lui [Rousseau], les missionnaires jésuites du Paraguay avaient écrit des *Lettres* où ils opposaient les vertus de leurs catéchumènes aux vices des civilisés, et répandu en Europe des préjugés sur la supériorité de l'homme sauvage."

³ See arguments drawn by geographers like Apollodorus from the term *Ἀζήσος*, in Strabo vii. 3. 7; and Gilbert Murray's "Greece and the Progress of Man" in *The Rise of the Greek Epic*.

⁴ Berard, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*, II, 175, 245; Maine, *Ancient Law*, p. 120.

⁵ See especially iii. 38; and Bury, *Ancient Greek Historians*, p. 44.

⁶ Book iv.

⁷ Herod. iv. 103, 106; Pseudo-Platonic *Minos* 315 B.

first flush of their triumph in the Persian Wars had faded, as embodying all that was best in human achievement.¹ The issue of that conflict was, indeed, the final vindication of a mode of life which had been till then by no means unprecarious. In Athens, above all, the past misgivings and hesitations to which the pages of Herodotus bear ample witness now gave way to that exaltation of spirit and confident pressing forward to the future which ushered in her Golden Age;² and so, perhaps, it is no accident that Aeschylus, who fought at Marathon and wrote the *Persae*, was, so far as we know, the first Greek to bring into clear relief the idea of human progress from a helpless, brutish existence to the arts of life,³ or that Sophocles, who as a boy had led the victory chant after Salamis, was inspired to hymn the marvelous conquests of man over the blind forces of a reluctant world.⁴

Henceforth the deliverance of man from savagery to civilization by the grace of Prometheus, or Palamedes, or by his own upward striving becomes a recurring theme of the Athenian drama.⁵ The latest example of it in the tragic poets is a fragment of Moschion⁶ where we are well on the way to the organic development theory⁷ of the fifth book of Lucretius:

Time was when mortals lived the life of beasts
And dwelt in mountain grotts and sunless caves;
For sheltering houses they had none as yet
Nor spacious city strong with masoned towers.

¹ So in Euripides, *Orestes*, κοινὸς Ἑλλήνων νόμος (495), saves the world from the brutish violence of barbarism,

τὸ θηριῶδες τοῦτο καὶ μαιφρόνον
παύων, ὃ καὶ γῆν καὶ πόλεις ὄλλυσ' αἰεὶ (523, 524)

Cf. Dümmler, *Prolegomena zu Platon's Staat*, pp. 47-49.

² For the psychological effects of the defeat of Persia, see Arist. *Pol.* 1341a. 30; Diodorus 12. 1. 3, 4.

³ *Prom. Bound*, 462 ff. Xenophanes anticipates Aeschylus in a brief couplet:

οὔτοι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πάντα θεοὶ θνητῶν ὑπέδειξαν
ἀλλὰ χρόνῳ ζήτουντες ἐφευρίσκουσιν ἀμείνον

Frag. 18 in Diels *Frag. der Vorsokratiker*. The idea of improvement in human conditions was, of course, implicit in culture-hero myths; it may possibly have been a part of epic tradition, but the dating of the Homeric Hymn to Hephaestus is pure guesswork.

⁴ *Antigone* 332-64.

⁵ Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Frag.*, pp. 59, 236, 542, 771, 931; Eur. *Suppl.* 201 ff.; Meineke, *Poet. Com. Graec.*, pp. 706, 707.

⁶ Nauck, p. 813.

⁷ Benn, *Greek Philosophers*, II, 99.

No curving plows then broke the swarthy glebe,
 The nurse of corn, nor pruning iron bestowed
 Its care on teeming rows of vines; but Earth
 Was waste and barren, yielding up no fruit.¹
 Men fed on human flesh by slaughtering men;
 And Law lay prostrate; Violence sat the throne
 With Zeus; the strong devoured the helpless weak.
 But soon as Time, which brings all things to birth
 And fosters all, had wrought again a change
 In human life, whether by lending them
 Prometheus' wit or sheer Necessity
 Or Nature's self, through long experience,
 To be their guide, divine Demeter's gift
 Was found, a gentle sustenance; and found
 Was also Bacchus' pleasant spring; the land,
 Unsown before, was plowed by spans of oxen;
 Cities now they girt with walls and houses built,
 And changed their savage life to gentle ways.
 Thenceforth the law enjoined to hide the dead
 In tombs and give to the unsepulchered
 Their due of dust, and not to leave exposed
 Reminders of their former ghastly feast.²

Moschion's sketch dates probably from the fourth century, but, although the notion of progress upward from savagery recurs in this period and later,³ it is especially characteristic of the pride of achievement and buoyant optimism which followed the Persian Wars.⁴

¹ Reading *κοῦ τροφὴν φέρουσα*.

² It is significant that every detail of this picture of primitive savagery may be supplied from the wild tribes described by Herodotus in his fourth book: the Troglodytes dwell in caves and are in other ways little removed from animality (183); the Scythians have no walled cities or fixed abodes (46); nor do they plow (19); the Androphagoi are the most savage of human creatures; they are without restraint of any principle of right or law, and feed on men (106).

It is, of course, not necessary to assume that Moschion took his colors directly from Herodotus; the essential point is that such details of ethnology were available in the fifth century and probably earlier. Gomperz, *Griechische Denker*, I, 312 (also Dümmler, *op. cit.*, p. 28), derives Moschion's sketch directly from Protagoras' *Περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀρχῇ καταστάσεως*, but Protagoras may have been indebted to Herodotus, perhaps "talked with him about ethnology at Thurii" as Gomperz fancies (I, 353); cf. also, Nestle, *Herodot's Verhältnis zur Philosophie und Sophistik*, pp. 17, 18.

³ See Isocrates *Panegyricus* 28; Aristotle *Pol.* 1269 A 5; Diodorus i. 8; Delphic Inscription in *Bulletin de Corr. Hellenique*, 1900, p. 96; and Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, p. 217.

⁴ Gomperz, I, 311, 312.

Toward the end of the fifth century there is a marked cooling down of enthusiasm for things as they are¹ and, from this time on, in increasing disenchantment, a growing conviction, indeed, that civilization has lost the way; that it represents an aberration, a *παρέκβασις*, from the right path; and that, after all that may be said for the present mode of life, its outstanding facts are greed, luxury, and man's inhumanity to man.

This reaction of feeling is strikingly instanced in the disposition of the philosophers, beginning with Socrates, to hold aloof from political life and to live more and more in the realm of the ideal,² and, above all, in the cry, "Back to Nature," which became the dominating idea of the Cynics and, after them, of the Stoic school for centuries. Nature is now no longer "red in tooth and claw with ravin," but is the wise teacher and sure guide which erratic society has ignored or contemned; and the natural man is no longer the savage "nasty and brutish," but a simple and kindly being, having but little and that little in common with others, and with that little content; and he is to be found only in a far-away past, a Hesiodic Golden Age, or in a far-away present which civilization has not touched and spoiled.

Such reversions to Hesiodic pessimism were evidently in the air before the fifth century closed.³ Perhaps they start with the Sophist Hippias whom Gomperz regards as the precursor of the Cynics and Stoics.⁴ At any rate, they are reflected in Plato,⁵ who, in certain moods, associates the virtues of temperance and justice with primitive conditions of a bygone age. In the *Laws*⁶ he pictures the early state of society as one of pastoral simplicity where all have enough to satisfy their necessary wants, but none is rich or poor, and so there is no occasion for envy or insolence or injustice to arise. In another passage of the same dialogue⁷ he refers to the view that, of old, men

¹ The after-glow of the triumph over Persia lingers fifty years, according to Diodorus xii. 1. 3, 4.

² Plato *Rep.* 496 D, E.

³ Pherecrates' *Ἀγριοί* seems to have been a burlesque on already current idealizations of uncivilized life. Plato *Protag.* 327 D; see Nestle, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

⁴ *Griechische Denker*, I, 348.

⁵ Barker, *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle*, pp. 151, 190.

⁶ 679 A-E; cf. *Laws* 713.

⁷ 782 A-D.

lived on the fruits of the earth, abstaining from flesh in Orphic fashion; and in the *Republic*, in which Socrates sketches the origin of a city in a state of health, he prescribes a diet exclusively vegetarian—bread and cakes and fruit spread out on the grass; the people reclining on boughs of myrtle and yew, wholesomely enjoying the frugal fare and each other's pleasant company, sound of limb and long of life and transmitting to their children an idyllic existence like their own. To this Glaucon objects that Socrates would not do differently if he were prescribing for a community of swine, and insists that people should live in a civilized manner with couches and tables and the dishes and desserts of a modern bill of fare. "Very good," says Socrates, "we are considering, it seems, not the growth of a healthy city merely, but of a city luxurious and inflamed. I dare say it is not a bad idea for thus we shall discover the rise of justice and injustice."¹

This notion that the fever of modern life sets in with the departure from the simple diet of the fruits of the earth is the basis of the *Culturgeschichte* of the geographer Dicaearchus, if we may trust Porphyry's brief summary of his *History of Greek Civilization*. Men lived in the beginning like Hesiod's Golden Race; they possessed none of the arts, not even that of tilling the soil; they subsisted on nature's food, fruits and herbs, without want and without surfeit, and therefore in a state of health, leisure, peace, and amity. There was no struggle for existence, no ground for strife, no cause for war. Then came the pastoral stage when people began to own property, to eat flesh, and to live luxuriously. Then arose envy, dissension, wars, which increased in the more elaborate life of the agricultural stage.²

Dicaearchus was known to Rousseau and perhaps influenced him,³ but the exact analogue to the "Back to Nature" cult in the eighteenth century is to be found in the teaching, and apparently in the practice, of the Cynics, notably Antisthenes and Diogenes.

¹ *Rep.* 372 B-E; and Adam's Commentary; cf. Myers, *Herodotus and Anthropology*, p. 163. But Plato does not commit himself to this point of view; his sympathy with it in this passage is playful, not to say ironical (Dümmler, *op. cit.*, pp. 61, 62); here, as elsewhere, the dramatist-philosopher eludes classification. See Paul Shorey "Plato, Lucretius, and Epicurus," *Harvard Studies in Class. Philology*, XII, 208.

² Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*, II, 233.

³ Pöhlmann, *Geschichte des antiken Kommunismus und Sozialismus*, I, 113.

Like Rousseau they condemned Prometheus as the great enemy of mankind.¹ The gods had withheld fire because they desired that men should continue in the ideal state of the Golden Age. The arts and institutions of civilization have enslaved us to effeminacy, luxury, and injustice. Hardiness, self-sufficiency, and spontaneous kindness are to be found only in the natural state or among the lower animals.² For the Cynics drew lessons, not only from uncivilized people, but from the animal world; like Walt Whitman, they—

Could turn and live with animals, they are so placid and self-contained.

They do not sweat and whine about their condition.

They do not lie awake in the dark and weep for their sins.

Not one is dissatisfied, not one is demented with the mania of owning things.

Not one kneels to another nor to his kind that lived thousands of years ago.

Not one is respectable or unhappy over the whole earth.³

From the Cynics the doctrine is taken over by the Stoics. Zeno, the founder of the school, defined the ideal society as a state of nature where the characteristic features of the modern city are conspicuously absent: it has no temples, no gymnasiums, no law courts, no money, no slaves, no private property even in women and children;⁴ and it becomes a commonplace of Stoic thought that the course of civilization has been steadily away from the natural kindness and contentment of the Golden Age. Aratus, for example, draws a pretty picture of the good old days when men had not yet sailed the sea in search of gain, but were satisfied to till the soil and to subsist on the produce of their fields. The spirit of Justice then lived on earth, ever present with men and ever heeded by them, and there was no strife, no lawsuits, no slaughter. In the less righteous Silver Age Justice retired to the mountains, whence she came down at evening to chide the people for their sins and to warn them of evils to come. When the cruel race of bronze was born, which was the first to forge the sword and slay oxen for food,⁵ she withdrew

¹ Gomperz, *op. cit.*, II, 117; Dio Chrys. *Or.* vi. 25, 30.

² Dio Chrys. *Or.* vi. 21-34.

³ *Ibid.*, xl. 32.

⁴ Diog. Laert. vii. 33.

⁵ See Plutarch's use of these lines in his sketch of the progress of cruelty from the killing of animals to the wholesale slaughter of men in war, *Περὶ Σαρκοφαγίας*, 998 A-B.

altogether from this odious generation and went to dwell in the heavens.¹ Posidonius, also, the last representative of Greek Stoicism and a great popularizer of the doctrine to the Roman world, associated justice with the golden simplicity of the life of primitive man, and regarded the slaughter of animals for food as the fatal step toward organized cruelty and war.²

Now these thinkers were not merely playing with traditional fancies to express their revolt against the shams and shows of artificial society; neither could they have been blind to the fact that civilization represents, at least in some respects, an advance over primitive conditions; πόλις ἄνθρωπον διδάσκει was a truth as obvious to them as to Simonides. They were not, however, obsessed by our modern habit of measuring progress in terms of "Twentieth Century Limiteds" and high explosives;³ on the contrary, the ancient sages from Socrates to Marcus Aurelius emphasize the insignificance of the external trappings and circumstances of life and the all-importance of that right state of the soul in relation to other souls which they called δικαιοσύνη; and the reactionary view which prevails from the fourth century on evidently rests on a sincere conviction that whatever gains civilization may have made have been won at the expense of that social sympathy and kindness which are fundamental for human well-being. Even Lucretius, who is our best source for the theory of progress, cannot shake himself free from a cynical view of contemporary civilization;⁴ his doctrine of the simple life according to nature differs very little from that of the Cynics and the Stoics;⁵ his picture of the life of primitive man borrows attractive colors from the Hesiodic description of the Golden Race⁶ and anticipates in many points the ideal savage of Rousseau.⁷ Existence had its tragedies

¹ *Phaenomena* 101-34.

² "primaque e caede ferarum

Incaluisse putem maculatum sanguine ferrum" [Ovid *Met.* xv. 107].

Ovid's picture of degeneration is probably derived, through Varro, from Posidonius; see Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, p. 194, and Georges Lafaye, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs*, pp. 198-202.

³ This point is sufficiently emphasized by Ferrero, *Ancient Rome and Modern America*, p. 46 and *passim*.

⁴ For a full discussion of the problem presented by Lucretius' inconsistency, see Eduard Norden, "Philosophische Ansichten über die Entstehung des Menschengeschlechts, seine kulturelle Entwicklung und das goldene Zeitalter," in *Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher für Class. Phil.*, Suppl., Band 19, pp. 416 ff.

⁵ See beginning of Book ii.

⁶ v. 942 ff.

⁷ v. 925 ff.

then, such as occasional death from wild beasts, but it is left for the refined cruelty of a later age to send in a single day thousands of men, marching with banners spread, into the jaws of death¹—a sentiment which is not far removed from the Stoic commonplace that progress in power has meant progress in cruelty and that our inventions have been turned to our destruction.²

The first influence, then, which we have to take into account in explaining the theory of degeneration is an out-and-out disenchantment with the results of the arts and inventions of civilized man.³ This alone is, perhaps, enough to inspire poetic dreams of an ideal past; but the well-considered doctrine of the philosophers that man in the natural state is endowed with the fundamental social virtues which the characteristic institutions of civilization have conspired to vitiate or destroy must, to some extent at least, have been grounded on experience and observation. When they sought for justice in the actual relations of living men, they found it, not in the *τρυφῶσα πόλις* as Plato calls it, but in the more simple life of peasants and shepherds where *πλεονεξία* had not dried up the milk of human kindness;⁴ and among far-away races whose primitive conditions had remained undisturbed by contact with the sophisticated world.

The ethnology of so-called primitive peoples has always presented striking contrasts to the life of civilization, and these contrasts have not always favored the latter. Professor Tylor in his chapter on the "Development of Culture," admits that "ethnographers, who seek in modern savages types of the remotely ancient human race at large, are bound by such examples to consider the rude life of primeval man under favorable conditions to have been, in its measure, a good and happy life."⁵ He refers to the experience of Sir Alfred Wallace, who says:

I have lived with communities of savages, in South America and in the East, who have no laws or law courts but the public opinion of the village

¹ v. 988 ff.

² Seneca *N.Q.* 5. 18. 15, "nihil invenies tam manifestae utilitatis quod non in contrarium transeat culpa"; cf. Tibull. i. 10. 1-6, and Kirby Smith's commentary.

³ "Eine übersättigte Cultur, im Ekel vor sich selbst," Rohde, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

⁴ "Beatus ille qui procul negotiis,
ut prisca gens mortalium,
paterna rura bobus exercet suis,
Solutus omni faenore."

⁵ *Primitive Culture*, I, 30.

freely expressed. Each man scrupulously respects the rights of his fellow, and any infraction of these rights rarely or never takes place. In such a community all are nearly equal. There are none of those wide distinctions of education and ignorance, wealth and poverty, master and servant, which are the products of our civilization; there is none of that widespread division of labor, which, while it increases wealth, also produces conflicting influences; there is not that severe competition and struggle for existence, or for wealth, which the dense population of civilized countries inevitably creates. All incitements to great crimes are thus wanting, and petty ones are repressed, partly by the influence of public opinion, but chiefly by that natural sense of justice and of his neighbor's rights, which seems to be in some degree inherent in every race of man. Now, although we have progressed vastly beyond the savage state in intellectual achievements, we have not advanced equally in morals. . . . It is not too much to say that the mass of our populations have not at all advanced beyond the savage code of morals and have in many cases sunk below it.¹

The Greeks also had from an early period traditions of such innocent tribes, who, living simply, without differentiation of property or function, were "the justest of men." There were, for example, the Aethiopians in the extreme South and the Indians of the Far East,² but these were semifabulous races of whom they had no direct knowledge. Their actual experience with uncivilized tribes was drawn mainly from the contact of their settlements with the peoples north and east of the Black Sea.³ As early as Homer we have a reference to the Mysians who fed on the milk of mares and were *δικαιότατοι ἀνθρώπων*.⁴ Aeschylus in a fragment of the *Prometheus Unbound* speaks of the well-governed Scythians, whose food is the milk of mares;⁵ and in another fragment of the same play⁶ there is a more extended sketch of the Gabians, a people most righteous and

¹ *Malay Archipelago*, II, 460-61. For similar observations and generalizations, compare Stefánson, "My Quest in the Arctic," *Harper's Magazine*, CXXVI, 512; and Georg Forster's confirmation of the Garden of Eden story from his explorations with Captain Cook, cited by Myers, p. 44.

² Rohde, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

³ For the experience of the Greeks with these northern tribes, see the introduction to the thorough work of Neumann, *Die Hellenen im Skythenlande*.

⁴ II. xiii. 4-6.

⁵ Nauck, 198; cf. Choerilus, frag. 13 (Didot):

μηλονόμοι δὲ Σάκαι, γενεῇ Σκύθαι . . .
νομάδων γε μὲν ἦσαν ἀποικοὶ
ἀνθρώπων νομίμων.

⁶ Nauck, 196.

kindly to strangers, who do not stir the soil with plow or hoe, but live on the natural produce of the earth.¹

Even Herodotus, who sees in the northern tribes mainly unregenerate savages,² makes exceptions of the Argippaeans, whose food is the fruit of trees, who wrong no man, and are wronged by none;³ and of the Issedonians, who, save for one savage custom, are said to be just, and to treat their women as equals.⁴

The geographer Ephorus, who was apparently the first to describe the Scythian tribes at any length, contrasted two types of these northern barbarians, the savage *Ἀνθρωποφάγοι* and a sequestered tribe of nomads whom he identifies with Homer's *Γαλακταφάγοι*. The latter he describes as dwelling in wagons, abstaining from animal food, harming no living thing, having all things in common, even wives and children, waging no war against others, and free from attack because they possessed nothing to tempt aggression.⁵ The philosopher Posidonius, whose interests embraced also geography and ethnology, devoted much attention to the Mysians, their pious scruples against taking life, their diet of milk and honey and cheese, their moral simplicity and innocence,⁶ and appears to have drawn from them arguments for his theory of the original state of man in the Golden Age.⁷

There were not wanting those who, as Apollodorus, took a consistent view of savagery and dismissed such accounts as poetic moonshine.⁸ Against these skeptics Strabo takes up the cudgels and challenges them to explain the fact that some of the nomad Scythians of his own day still preserved very much the same manner of life as that ascribed to them by earlier authorities, notwithstanding that by this time Greek civilization had spread its degenerative influence

¹ It is tempting to take Eumenides, 706, οὐτ' ἐν Σκύθαισιν οὔτε Πέλοπος ἐν τόποις to mean that Scythia and Sparta are the traditional homes of justice, as do Riese (*Die Idealisierung der Naturvölker des Nordens in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, p. 11) and Pöhlmann (*op. cit.*, I, 134), but surely the significance of these places is here purely geographical; cf. Soph. *Oed. Col.*, 694.

² iv. 127.

³ iv. 23.

⁴ iv. 26.

⁵ Müller, *Fr. Hist. Graec.*, I, 257, p. 257; frags. 76, 78.

⁶ Strabo vii. 3. 3.

⁷ Schmekel, *Die Phil. d. Mittl. Stoa.*, pp. 287-88.

⁸ *Πλάσματα*, Strabo vii. 3. 7, 10.

to almost all peoples of the world and infected them, especially where they had come into contact with the sea, with the poison of greed and inhumanity.¹

It is easy to read both in and between the lines of Strabo's extended discussion of this question that his interest in it is not merely that of a dispassionate ethnographer, but almost that of a zealot who is defending an important article of faith.² His earnestness and heat betray as evidently as if he had said it in so many words that he is here the spokesman of a sect who cherished the nomad Scythians as a pure type of man in the natural state and derived from them the principal argument for their belief in the degenerative influence of civilization.³

If, furthermore, we take the outstanding features in the description of these northern tribes—a pastoral or prepastoral life; a frugal, mainly a vegetarian, diet; community of property or no property at all; community of wives and children; a peaceful, orderly, and kindly existence—and compare them with the characteristics ascribed by the philosophers to the original state of man in the Golden Age, the correspondence is too exact to be accidental.

But to what extent the facts suggested theory or theory supplied the facts is, perhaps, open to discussion. The historicity of the milk-eating, peace-loving nomads is commonly doubted; Rohde, for example, apparently treats them as a product of the idealizing imagination and thinks them as unreal as the Hyperboreans;⁴ and our

¹ vii. 3. 7.

² vii. 3. 7, 11: ἀπλουστάτους τε γὰρ αὐτοὺς νομίζομεν καὶ ἥκιστα κακέντροχεῖς εὐτελεστέρους τε πολλὸν ἡμῶν καὶ αὐταρκεστέρους.

³ ἃ δοκεῖ μὲν εἰς ἡμετέροια συντείνειν διαφθείρει δὲ τὰ ἥθη καὶ ποικίλιαν ἀντὶ τῆς ἀπλότητος . . . εἰσάγει (vii. 3. 7, 22) reveals the Stoic.

⁴ *Der griech. Roman.*, p. 217. Rhode follows Riese, who contends that the tradition of the nomad Scythians begins with Homer, whose fancy sketched the first outline of a milk-eating, just-dealing, northern race, and that henceforth the Greek imagination filled in the sketch with various ideals, mainly Pythagorean and Platonic (*op. cit.*, pp. 20, 21). Riese dismisses the researches of Ephorus as bookish and second-hand. Neumann, however, regards Ephorus as a trustworthy authority, who may idealize the customs of the Scythians, but always does so on a basis of fact (*op. cit.*, I, 315 ff.).

The crux of the problem is the community of wives and children. This according to Riese is read into the institutions of the Scythians from Plato. But, in the first place, the limited communism of Plato is not the communism attributed to the Scythians; and, in the next place, Plato cannot be held responsible for the sexual

own view is likely to be determined by a more or less a priori assumption of how the Stone Man and his later representatives should have behaved in order not to disturb a consistent plan of evolution. But we can at any rate be sure of these points: that the nomad Scythians of Ephorus were regarded by the Greeks generally as historical;¹ that the preponderance of ancient authority is in favor of this view; and that there is ethnologically no improbability in attributing to uncivilized tribes of that time the unspoiled simplicity and the substantial virtues which Stefánson found in the Eskimos, who had never seen a white man, and which led him to infer that "the hand of evolution had written the Golden Rule in the hearts of the contemporaries of the mammoth millenniums before the Pyramids were built."²

We are, then, in accord with the testimony of antiquity as well as with modern experience in concluding that the Greeks in their contact with uncivilized peoples found two sets of facts—one which supported the view that primeval man existed in a slough of brutish

promiscuity, more or less idealized, ascribed by Herodotus to the Auseans (iv. 180); to the Agathyrsians (iv. 104); and to the Massagetae (i. 216). Furthermore, it is quite clear from the last reference that the common Greek view, from which Herodotus here dissents, attributed this custom to the Scythians as did Ephorus and later writers generally (see, fr. ex., Nicolaus Damascenus, 123; Müller, III, 460). Indeed, such contrasts to their own marriage customs the Greeks found in many parts of the world; other examples are reported by Aristotle, *Pol.* 1262 A 19; Xanthus, frag. 28; Theopompus, frag. 222; Nicolaus, frags. 111, 135, in Müller, *Frag. Hist. Graec.*; and Diodorus ii. 58—enough to give plausibility to the dramatic exaggeration in Eur. *Andromache*, 173 ff.

τοιούτων πᾶν τὸ βάρβαρον γένος
πατήρ τε θυγατρὶ παῖς τε μητρὶ μίγνεται
κόρη τ' ἀδελφῷ.
. καὶ τῶν δ' οὐδὲν ἐξείργει νόμος.

For parallels from modern ethnology, see Andrew Lang's article "Family," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

No one denies, so far as I know, that the customs of the so-called nature peoples have been "idealized" in interpretation, as when Strabo says that the Scythians had wives and children in common *πλατονικῶς* (vii. 3. 7) or when Lewis Morgan finds the exact conditions of his "Maylayan" or "Consanguine" family in Plato's *Timaeus* 18 C, D. (*Ancient Society*, p. 417); but it seems more probable that ethnological facts, however imperfectly understood, should have given suggestion to theory (see Gomperz, II, 413; Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 152; Dümmler, *op. cit.*, p. 56; and Adam's edition of Plato's *Republic*, I, 355) than that Plato's ideal of communism should have been foisted on the nomad Scythians and other primitive peoples.

¹ Strabo vii. 3. 7, 10. αἰτῇ ἢ ὑπόληψις καὶ νῦν ἔτι συμμένει παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν.

² "My Quest in the Arctic," *Harper's Magazine*, CXXVI, 512.

savagery, the other that he lived in an Eden of innocent simplicity; that at the time of exultant pride in their own life and contempt for what lay outside of it they seized on savage and revolting practices among the wild barbarians as typical of the dark age from which they were confidently pressing forward to a golden future; and that later in a period of discontent and disillusionment their philosophers emphasized the uncorrupted virtues of primitive races to prove that time must "run back and fetch the Age of Gold."¹

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

¹ The poetic fancy of Milton and Vergil and Shelley that the Golden Age will be restored is also a Stoic hope. See Kirby Smith's article "Ages of the World" in *Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, I, 198.

THE SOURCES AND THE EXTENT OF PETRARCH'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE LIFE OF VERGIL

BY DUANE REED STUART

A conspicuous feature of Vergilian study in the last decade and a half has been the effort to arrive at a saner conception of the events of the poet's life than has held good hitherto. That substantial progress has been made in this direction is undeniable. The higher criticism of the *Appendix* and of the *Eclogues* which, at least from the beginning of this century, has usurped perhaps the supreme place in the interests of students of Vergil has precipitated fruitful, though not always final, discussion of various topics germane to the poet's life and literary activities and has furnished us with new standards for differentiating *Wahrheit und Dichtung* in his works. Furthermore, thanks to the editions of the *Vitae Vergilianae* produced by Diehl¹ and Brummer,² books which supplied a long-felt want, and to sundry articles from the pens of Klotz,³ Kroll,⁴ Leo,⁵ Norden,⁶ Vollmer,⁷ and others, we may boast of a newly acquired intelligence in the use of the ancient biographies of Vergil.

These additions that latter-day research has made to our knowledge of Vergil's life have been due, of course, not to the discovery of new documentary evidence, but to the rationalistic criticism of sources long existing. An enlightened estimate of the reliability of the data contained in these sources has freed us from inveterate and "vulgar errors." So far as the raw material for the reconstruction of Vergil's life is concerned, the humanists of the fifteenth century were equipped about as adequately as are we. At least, after the discovery of the *Catalepton*—as Birt has taught us in *Jugendverse*

¹ *Die Vitae Vergilianae und ihre antiken Quellen* (Bonn, 1911).

² *Vitae Vergilianae* (Leipzig, 1912).

³ *Rh. Mus.*, LXVI (1911), 155-60; LXVII (1912), 306-9.

⁴ *Ibid.*, LXIV (1909), 50-55.

⁵ *Hermes*, XXXVIII (1903), 1-18.

⁶ *Rh. Mus.*, LXI (1906), 166-177.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 481-90; *SB. der Bayer. Ak. Phil.-Hist. Kl.*, 1909, Abhand. 9, pp. 5-11.

und *Heimatpoesie Vergils*, no negligible source of information—they could have laid their hands on all the essential primary sources included in our modern apparatus. Nolzhaac goes so far as to say (*Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, 2d ed., I, 124) that even Petrarch, at the dawn of the Revival of Learning, knew concerning the life of Vergil all that can be learned from the poems and well-nigh all that the ancient sources and testimonia have to offer.

Petrarch's acquaintance with the genuine version of the *Vita* written by Aelius Donatus and based, as we know, on the biography of Vergil included in the *De viris illustribus* of Suetonius has long been regarded as indisputable. Nevertheless, no formal attempt has been made to present the evidence on which this belief rests except by Sabbadini,¹ whose studies have contributed in large measure to our knowledge of the classical scholarship of the Renaissance. Nolzhaac in both editions of his great work asserts categorically that Petrarch had read the Life of Vergil written by Donatus, but only in the first edition does he adduce any evidence in support of his affirmation. This evidence consists in a single datum which, unfortunately, turned out to be quite untenable. In note 6, p. 106, Nolzhaac reported the existence on the cover-leaf of the celebrated Vergil of Petrarch, which is now one of the treasures of the Ambrosian Library, of a long citation accompanied by the surface reference, *Donatus in vita Virgilii*. As Sabbadini subsequently pointed out,² the citation is not derived from the Suetonian Life, and the supposed surface reference is non-existent. Petrarch's appeal is to the commentary of Donatus on the *Eclogues*, whatever it was that the humanist knew under this name.³ Nolzhaac tacitly admitted his mistake by excising this part of his original note from his second edition (see p. 124). However, he left the statement in the text unaltered, presumably because he was content to rest his case on Sabbadini's

¹ "Quali biografie vergiliane fossero note al Petrarca," *Rend. del r. ist. Lomb. di sc. e lett.*, XXXIX (1906), 193-98.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 197.

³ Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci*, pp. 38-39, presents evidence that Petrarch had a commentary on the *Eclogues*, believed by him to be the work of Donatus. This is another rubric in the enigmas attached to the history of the commentary of Donatus. Let us hope that Professor Rand has put us on the road to a solution; see *Class. Quart.*, X (1916), 158.

article, which had appeared just prior to the publication of the second edition of *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*.

As the result of an endeavor to test for my own satisfaction and instruction the validity of the arguments advanced by Sabbadini in favor of the accepted view, I have found myself, to my own surprise, forced to the conclusion that the treatment previously accorded to this topic is unconvincing and incomplete. The pertinent data are far from being exhausted. I have tried, therefore, to assemble with greater fulness than has been done all that Petrarch knew or thought that he knew about the life and the personality of Vergil. Thus we shall be in a position to project upon the point at issue all available evidence and to realize in general the character and the sources of the great humanist's information concerning the Roman poet who was one of the chief idols and mentors of his intellectual life. First, I shall have to crave the patience of the reader while I summarize Sabbadini's arguments in the order in which he sets them forth.

1. In Petrarch's text of the Servian commentary on the works of Vergil, which frames the text of the poems in the *Ambrosianus*, Tarentum is cited as the place where Vergil breathed his last.¹ According to Donatus, ll. 131-32,² and Jerome *Euseb. Chron.* 2. 1998, the poet died at Brundisium. Petrarch twice refers to this variant tradition, once in *Famil.* 13. 4, Vol. II, p. 223, Fracassetti: "cuius cinerem vel Tarento ereptum vel Brundisio tua possidet ac sua Parthenope," again in *Itiner. Syriac.*: "Tarentum tibi monstrabitur . . . fatalis locus, quamvis alii Brundisium dicant." In the latter reference, *alii*, says Sabbadini, would seem to point to Donatus and Jerome.

2. In the Life by Donatus, ll. 100-103, is found the allusion, quoted by all the handbooks, to the pre-eminence bespoken for the *Aeneid* by Propertius in the famous couplet 2. 34. 65-66: "Aeneidos vixdum coeptae tanta extitit fama, ut Sextus Propertius non dubitaverit sic praedicare:

cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai:
nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade."

¹ The passage in question is found in the later manuscripts of Servius, such as the Codex Dresdensis; see Thilo-Hagen, I, p. 4.

² Unless otherwise indicated, references to the *Vita Donatiana* are given according to Brummer's text.

In Petrarch's second letter to Cicero (*Famil.* 24. 4, Vol. III, p. 266 Frac.), we read: "ut Aeneidi cederet Ilias [te] iussurum fuisse non dubito, quod iam ab initio Vergiliani laboris Propertius asseverare non timuit. Ubi enim Pierii operis fundamenta contemplatus est, quid de illis sentiret, et quid speraret aperte pronuntiavit his versibus: cedite," etc. Sabbadini asserts that Petrarch's words could not have been based directly on the text of Propertius, but must have been suggested by the context in the *Vita*, since here alone do we find definite, chronological allusion to the inchoate state of the *Aeneid*, expressed in the sentence "vixdum coeptae . . . fama," to which the phrase "iam ab initio Vergiliani laboris" harks back.

3. In *Famil.* 3. 11, Vol. I, p. 164 Frac., Petrarch refers to letters written by Augustus to Vergil and Horace, and to the democratic tone adopted by the Princeps in this correspondence with his two friends: "Mitto alia, iis fortasse mirabilia, . . . qui . . . principis illius ad eosdem humiles amicos, velut ex aequo missas, et saepe dulcibus blanditiis refertas, epistolas non legissent." Sabbadini remarks that only in the *Life* by Donatus is reported the letter of Augustus to Vergil. The context is given in ll. 104-7: "Augustus vero . . . supplicibus atque etiam minacibus per iocum litteris efflagitaret, 'ut sibi de Aeneide,' ut ipsius verba sunt, 'vel prima carminis ὑπογραφή vel quodlibet κῶλον' mitteretur.'"

4. Near the end of the poetical epistle to Vergil, Petrarch refers to the frustration of Vergil's wish that the *Aeneid* be burned:

. . . miserum Aeneam iam summa premebant
fata manu, iamque ore tuo damnatus abibat,
arsurumque iterum pietas Augusta secundis
eripuit flammis, quem non morientis amici
deiecti movere animi, meritoque supremas
contempsisse preces aevo laudabitur omni [*Famil.*
24. 11, Vol. III, p. 292 Frac.]

Sabbadini sees in the words *arsurumque . . . flammis* a reminiscence of the celebrated epigram of Sulpicius, quoted in one of its two variant versions in the *Life*, ll. 142 f. The concluding couplet runs thus:

infelix gemino cecidit prope Pergamon igni,
et paene est alio Troia cremata rogo.

Now, in my opinion, the cogency of these arguments is by no means absolute; examination will show that they do not all stand close scrutiny. Certain objections are bound to occur to one who is intent on settling beyond peradventure of a doubt the interesting, and not entirely trivial, question as to the biographies of Vergil known to Petrarch and utilized by him.

Apropos of Sabbadini's first point, it may well be urged that the plural *alii* does not definitely betoken a duality of sources. It is quite conceivable that Petrarch might have derived from the *Chronicon* only the tradition that makes Brundisium the scene of Vergil's death, and still have permitted *alii* to slip from his pen. Such laxity in reference is, as we know, one of those venial sins against the ethics of strict quotation that find ample analogy in the writers of every age. Or by the plural Petrarch may have intended to allude, not specifically to variant tradition found in one group of literary sources, but in general terms to report the currency, among one set of the *litterati* and *curiosi* of his own time, of the belief that Brundisium had stronger claims on the melancholy distinction than had Tarentum.

Luckily, however, we do not have to confine ourselves to conjectures as to what liberties Petrarch may have allowed himself in the technique of quotation. There is a third passage, overlooked by Sabbadini, the evidence of which is directly pertinent. In *De remediis utriusque fortunae*, Lib. 2. dial. 125 (p. 686, edition of 1649), Petrarch writes: "Virgilium mundo dedit Mantua; Brundisium, sive ut alii perhibent, Tarentum rapuit, nunc Neapolis tenet." Now, as I have previously remarked, the statement that Vergil died at Tarentum is found in certain late manuscripts of Servius, in which we find appended to the Servian biography of the poet the words: "periit autem Tarenti in Apuliae civitate," etc. (see Thilo-Hagen, p. 4; Diehl, p. 42). The exemplar from which Petrarch's text of Servius was derived belonged to this class. Furthermore, the Servian Life is the *only* literary source that presents this tradition. Hence it is evident that in the passage cited above Petrarch used *alii* loosely or was referring primarily to contemporary opinion. Evidently no inference of any weight can be derived from his use of *alii* in the passage from the *Itiner. Syriac.* cited by Sabbadini as an

indication that Petrarch had in mind the *Life* by Donatus as one of two sources.

As to Sabbadini's second argument: only a rather determined prejudgment could maintain that the lines of Propertius, read in the original context, give no pretext (*non da alcun appiglio*) for such chronological assumptions as those expressed in the words of Petrarch, "iam ab initio Virgiliani laboris" and "operis fundamenta contemplatus est." The context in Propertius speaks quite plainly of the inchoate *Aeneid*:

- 61 [iuuet] Actia Vergilium custodis litora Phoebi
 Caesaris et fortes dicere posse rates,
 qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitāt arma
 iactaque Lavinis moenia litoribus.
 Cedite, Romani scriptores, cedite Grai:
 66 nescioquid maius nascitur Iliade.

Lines 63-64 contain an unmistakable reminiscence of the opening lines of the *Aeneid*, as Rothstein *ad loc.* has observed. Certainly no great exegetical acumen was essential in order to discern that it is the *initia ipsa* of the *Aeneid* that are here echoed, that "nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitāt arma" "is now stirring to action the arms of Trojan Aeneas," means in poetical but plain language that the *Aeneid* was in the early stages of composition. *Nascitur* also is no obscure chronological indication, whether read in the context of the elegy or in the isolated couplet. We know enough about the technique of the author of the *Vita* to realize that probably the sole authority for the words *Aeneidos vixdum coeptae* was inference based on the passage from Propertius. It would be a needlessly harsh commentary on the intelligence of Petrarch to deny him the possession of the same degree of critical sense. Petrarch had read Propertius directly; two citations in the Ambrosian Vergil prove this fact beyond cavil.¹

It is, of course, one thing to contend that Petrarch's allusion could have been inspired solely by his knowledge of the elegy of Propertius, another to maintain that this was actually the case. One's attitude will be directly affected by what one can learn as to whether Petrarch knew the *Life* by Donatus and how far he depended

¹ See Nohac, I, 171; on reminiscences of Propertius in the poetry of Petrarch, consult J. S. Phillimore's addendum to Ellis, *Catullus in the 14th Century* (London, 1905), pp. 29-30.

on it, if at all. We must therefore reserve decision until all the forthcoming evidence has been examined. In the meantime, it is none the less essential to sound criticism to call attention to the over-dogmatism of Sabbadini in his treatment of this particular point.

There is an additional possibility which no thoroughgoing discussion should fail to take into consideration. Sabbadini assumes that only an alternative of sources existed for Petrarch's knowledge of the couplet, that he had perforce read it, if not in the elegy directly, then in the *Vita*. Herewith the fact is overlooked that the couplet has a textual tradition apart from both Propertius and the *Vita*. As the estimate given by one great poet of the masterpiece of a greater contemporary, the lines naturally attained great celebrity, hence were taken up by the *Florilegia*. Thus they are found in the Codex Salmasianus and in Parisinus 8069; see Baehrens, *PLM*, IV, 158, No. 163, Riese, *Anth. Lat.*, I, 214, No. 264. Certain poems of the *Anthology* were known to Petrarch—of one of these more hereafter. We cannot, of course, presume to say that a sylloge containing this couplet had been in Petrarch's hands. It may, however, with propriety be asserted that even a limited currency of the distich in extant *excerpta* enhances the possibility of Petrarch's having read it elsewhere than in the *Life*. A denial of the truth of one of Sabbadini's alternatives therefore does not inevitably prove the other. As it appears in the *Anthology*, the titulus indicates the authorship of the distich, and, as has been said, *nascitur* alone would justify inference on the part of an enlightened exegete.

Sabbadini's third argument, viewed by him as *un altro indizio sicuro*, does at first sight seem to be the most conclusive of all. He takes it for granted that the passage in *Famil.* 3. 11 transcribed above, in so far as it relates to the correspondence of Augustus with Vergil, was evoked by acquaintance with the brief quotation culled by the author of the *Vita* from the letter to Vergil. It is true that only in the *Life* by Donatus among our extant sources does an excerpt from this letter occur. Priscian, an author studied by Petrarch from his youth on and frequently cited by him, quotes (p. 901, Keil, Vol. II, p. 533), the words *excucurristi a Neapoli* addressed by Caesar to Vergil and, as we must suppose, notwithstanding the absence of surface reference, extracted from a letter written by the

Principes to Vergil while the poet was sojourning in Campania. These three words offer scant grounds for such a generalization as Petrarch's, yet they do show that Augustus wrote to Vergil as man to man. From Macrobius also Petrarch knew that Vergil was a favored correspondent of Augustus; in the oft-quoted passage, *Saturnalia* 1. 24. 10-11, he had read a part of Vergil's reply to the request of Augustus for some specimen portion of the *Aeneid*, a petition which was preferred in the letter partly quoted in the Life. Vergil's reply begins: "ego vero frequentes a te litteras accipio." Petrarch, of course, was intimately acquainted with the works of Macrobius. How well he knew this passage in the *Saturnalia* is shown by *Seniles* 4. 5, p. 785, *Opera*,¹ where he alludes directly to the letter of Vergil, reproduces the substance, and echoes the language of the whole context, thus: "Virgilium . . . constat divino illo in opere quod sibi ultimum est . . . altius aliquid sensisse quam quod loquitur, idque non modo poetantium communis habet opinio sed poetae ipsius epistula quaedam ad Augustum Caesarem scripta testatur, ubi se rem maximam et, praeter id quod apparet, studii multiplicis indigam dicit ingressum." Compare the words of Macrobius: "si in hac opinione es ut Maro tibi nihil nisi poeticum sensisse aestimetur . . . audi quid de operis sui multiplici doctrina ipse pronuntiet"; and *infra*: "ut . . . tantum opus ingressus mihi videar."

We must not, of course, forget that, in the passage cited by Sabbadini, Petrarch mentions the possibility of *reading* letters written by Augustus to his two poet friends. The same implication is contained in other passages in Petrarch. Petrarch is noticeably fond of reverting to the topic of the close relations maintained by Augustus with the two men of genius who were so far beneath him in the social order. Naturally the imagination of the neo-Latin bard, himself an intimate of the princes of his day, was impressed by the amiability, not to say eagerness, with which the erstwhile lord of the world cultivated the friendship of the two great poets of Rome and strove to place the relationship on a footing marked, not only by absence of all condescension on his part, but by a display

¹ In conformity with the usual practice, references to the *Opera omnia* are cited from the second edition issued at Basle in 1581.

of democratic informality and self-depreciation. We may add to the passage cited by Sabbadini the following allusions to the correspondence: *Famil.* 23. 2, Vol. III, p. 184 Frac.: "si enim Virgilio, si Flacco gloriosum fuit Augusti Caesaris et notitiam et convictum et epistulas promereri"; *Senil.* 11. 1, p. 881, *Op.*: "Augustus Caesar cui temporali potentia par non fuit, saepe humilibus cum amicis, nominatim cum Virgilio atque Horatio poetis, altis¹ viris ingenii sed ortus humillimis,¹ familiarissimas fecit epistulas ut dulce sit mirumque legentibus in tam sublimi statu talem animum tantamque mansuetudinem inveniri"; *Senil.* 14. 1, Fracassetti's Italian translation: "De re publica optime administranda liber" (p. 385, *Op.*); "[Augustus] habuit ergo in sodalicio . . . Publium quoque Virgilium, Horatium Flaccum, poetas egregios, ad quos sunt ipsius principis epistulae, quibus ille summus hominum mundi dominus duobus illis rusticanis, Mantuanae ac Venusinae originis, non se aequat tantummodo sed submittit; *De remediis utriusque fortunae*"; 2. dial. 5: "vester ille Virgilius rusticanis parentibus fuit nec se libertino ac praecore patre natus Flaccus erubuit; . . . Ipse [Augustus] horum duorum ignobilium . . . amicitiam et convictum ceu grande aliquid blandis ac dulcibus epistolis flagitaret."

Now Petrarch's characterization of the tone and spirit of the missives of Augustus is, strictly speaking, applicable only to the content of the fragments of the Princeps' letters to Horace preserved in the Suetonian *Vita* of this poet. To these Petrarch's comments are peculiarly apposite. *Submittit* is a word perfectly describing the humility displayed by Augustus in his overtures. It is only in the letters to Horace that we find the Princeps "wheedling in honeyed phrases for friendship and camaraderie." Petrarch was undoubtedly familiar with the *Vita* of Horace. In *Famil.* 20. 7, Vol. III, p. 26 Frac., he quotes from it almost verbatim a sentence of the letter written by Augustus to acknowledge the receipt of one of the books of Horace and voicing a jocular protest on the part of the Princeps against the brevity of the *libellus*.² In themselves, the few words

¹ Thus the edition of Basle; presumably we should read *alti* . . . *humillimi*.

² "Vereri autem mihi videris ne maiores libelli tui sint quam ipse es," Roth, p. 298; cf. Petrarch, *op. cit.*: "non tuam, fateor, legere visus epistolam sum, sed Flacci, cum quo iocans Caesar: 'vereri,' inquit, 'mihi videris ne maiores res libelli tui sint, quam ipse es.'"

quoted by Donatus from the letter to Vergil give no warrant whatever for inclusion in the characterization so accurately given of the spirit pervading the letters to Horace and of the phraseology in which these are couched. There is nothing but Donatus' comment on the vein of the letter to Vergil—"supplicibus atque etiam minacibus per iocum litteris"—to give pause to an expression of utter skepticism as to whether Petrarch's several allusions were founded at all on a knowledge of this section of the Life. Certain it is that if he knew this context his recollection of it became so merged in the more vivid impression naturally exerted by the racy and comparatively extensive fragments in the Life of Horace that he could forget that in the biography of Vergil there is no entreaty made for intimate friendship, but simply for advance sheets of the *Aeneid*.

Should we not, therefore, admit the possibility that Petrarch's comments may be the result of generalization based on the passage in Macrobius and on our extant fragments of the letters to Horace, granting, perhaps, that the passage in Priscian partakes too much of the character of the proverbial needle in a haystack to make probable the assumption that it also may have played a part in crystallizing Petrarch's ideas on this subject? The objection that the implication in more than one of the passages quoted above is to the effect that letters, or at least a letter, written by Augustus to Vergil, were accessible to Petrarch and had been read by him, will appear by no means final to one who recalls what we know concerning the workings of the humanist's imagination, how tricks of memory and lapse of time conspired to make him the victim of self-deception as to the works of ancient literature which he had read. Such hallucinations were furthered by the bibliophilic conditions of the times; any day might be marked by the discovery of some new treasure, the work might be handled or possessed by scholar and collector, then, through such causes as petty proprietary jealousy, unscrupulous "borrowing"—to adopt Huck Finn's euphemism for a "shorter, uglier word"—might vanish into the limbo of the inaccessible, there to remain, perhaps, for years.

The most famous instance of the expansiveness of which Petrarch's imaginative processes were capable in respect to the events of his intellectual life is to be seen in the development into an *idée fixe*

of the notion that he had once possessed the treatise of Cicero, *De Gloria*. Nohac's reasoning on this subject (I, 260 f.) is most convincing. But we do not need to confine ourselves to one hypothesis, however attractive, to find support for another. The workings of an analogous obsession may be traced in connection with this very point that here concerns us, viz., the basis of Petrarch's apparently circumstantial knowledge of the correspondence of Augustus with Vergil.

Nohac (I, 266, n.) has called attention to Petrarch's assertion, *Res. memor.* 1. 2, p. 395 *Op.*, that, in his youth, he had once had in his hands a book of epigrams and letters composed by Augustus, but that in subsequent years he had sought the work in vain. The contents are definitely appraised: "scripsit et epigrammatum librum et epistularum ad amicos, conditum facetissima gravitate et luculentissima brevitate"; also certain external characteristics are noted: "opus inexplicatum et carie semesum." To be sure, Franz Rühl in *B.Ph.W.*, 1895, col. 468, suggests that perhaps this is not a case of confusion on Petrarch's part, but that he had actually seen such a book, identical, perhaps, with a *Liber Octaviani imperatoris*, listed in a twelfth-century catalogue from Limoges.¹ It is very unlikely, however, that Petrarch had ever seen, though he came to believe that he had, a book of such a nature from the pen of Augustus. It is barely possible that some late compiler had assembled from such sources as the biographies of Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius, written by Suetonius, and the *Vita Horatii* the fragments of Augustus' correspondence, and that this was the book that Petrarch had once possessed for a time. It is far more likely that the words in *Res. memor.* resulted from a confusion in Petrarch's mind of the *Liber epigrammatum*, mentioned by Suetonius (*Vit. Aug.* c. 85) as among the poetic attempts of the Princeps, and of the numerous quotations from the letters of Augustus found in the biographer. As to Rühl's theory of a genuine *Liber Octaviani* existing down to humanistic times, it may be remarked in passing that such a combination by Augustus, into one book, of poetic epigrams and prose epistles, as the literal acceptance of Petrarch's words entails, would have been an incredible breach of the conventionalities of literary arrangement.

¹ See Manitius, *Philologisches aus alten Bibliothekskatalogen*, *Rh. Mus.*, XLVII (1892), "Ergänzungsheft," p. 27.

A piece of kindred evidence, germane to our question and quite indubitable, is forthcoming from the following sentence, *Famil.* 24. 12, Vol. III, p. 294 Frac.: "Virgilii epistolas oratione libera non inamoenas legi." As a matter of fact, Petrarch could have read only the fragment of the letter preserved in Macrobius. For the moment, this fragment is multiplied into a plurality by an exaggeration, psychic or verbal, it is difficult to decide which. The explanation which best accords with the line of indications that we have been following is to assume the influence of an aberration of the memory. In either case we have an unquestionable proof that great caution must be exercised in basing on what Petrarch tells us about the correspondence of Augustus and Vergil conclusions as to the sources from which this apparent knowledge was derived.

In the presentation of his fourth argument, Sabbadini's method is not characterized by the acumen which usually attaches to his work. It is an erroneous assumption that the echo in the poetic Epistle to Vergil, if echo it be, must necessarily go back solely to the hexastich commemorating the proposed burning of the *Aeneid* and incorporated, with mention of its author, Sulpicius, in the Life by Donatus. The conceit that, figuratively speaking, a second Iliupersis was averted when the *Aeneid* was saved from the flames is a favorite topos of the metrical—I shall not say poetical—*ludi* and epigrammatic *tours de force* which were evoked by the name and fame of Vergil, and which are plentifully illustrated in the *Latin Anthology*. The motif, for example, is expressed perhaps more graphically in a variant of the hexastich. I quote from Riese, *Anth. Lat.*, II, 121, No. 653; Baehrens, *PLM*, IV, 169, No. 177, took unwarrantable liberties with the text.

Carmina Vergilius Phrygium prodentia Martem
 Secum fatali iusserat igne mori.
 Tucce negat, Varius prohibet, superaddite Caesar
 Nomen in Aeneae Bücheler, recte?) non sinis esse nefas.
 O quam paene iterum geminasti funere funus,
 Troia, bis interitus causa futura tui.

The theories voiced in the last century by Baehrens (*Praef.*, pp. 44-45) and by others as to the origin and the authorship of the two versions, a question complicated by the fact that in the so-called

Life by Probus the first four lines of the epigram, in the version appearing in Donatus, are attributed to a Servius Varus, otherwise *non est*, need not concern us here. The suggestion of Norden (*Rh. Mus.*, 61 [1906], p. 175, n. 1) that Servius Varus is a stupid invention, and that the same Sulpicius played one tune on two keys, as we know the Greek epigrammatists and Martial sometimes did, is a rational explanation of the existence of the doublet. For us, as it should have been for Sabbadini, the significant thing is that there existed, apart from the text of the Life by Donatus, a version of the hexastich which, so far as its language goes, furnishes as close a parallel to Petrarch's "Aenean arsurumque iterum . . . secundis flammis" as does the variant found in the *Vita*. To be sure, the version in the *Anthology* is found in one manuscript only—i.e., E—a fact which of course makes against the suggestion that it was this version with which Petrarch was acquainted. None the less, in the interests of accuracy Sabbadini should have apprised his readers of the existence of any possibility that might modify his conclusion.

The theme of the second burning of Troy occurs also in another poem of the *Anthology*, one which possessed a somewhat wider textual dissemination, i.e. *PLM*, IV, 183, No. 185 = Riese I, 198, No. 242. In the first four lines the death of Vergil and his injunction that the *Aeneid* be destroyed are related; then the piece continues:

Roma rogat, precibusque isdem tibi supplicat orbis,
Ne pereant flammis tot monumenta ducum.
Anne iterum Troiam, sed maior, flamma cremabit?

This poem is found in the Codex Salmasianus under the heading "Unde supra," which looks back to some other poem treating a like theme. It is also contained in the Vatican manuscript No. 1575 (Z Baehrens) of the eleventh century, with a heading which, with greater piquancy than regard to chronology, attributes it to Cornelius Gallus. This fiction was doubtless instrumental in securing to the decastich the popularity which it evidently came to possess, for it is found rather widely distributed in manuscripts of the fifteenth century as well as in the older editions of Vergil.

These instances of the motif, however, are of minor significance for our purpose in comparison with another which I am about to add; they have been cited in order to show that Petrarch and his generatio

might conceivably have met the theme in sources other than the *Life* by Donatus, a contingency which Sabbadini totally ignored. We need not, however, confine ourselves to indicating possibilities. We can, if I am not oversanguine, lay our hands on the specific influence to which Petrarch reacted in penning the lines in the *Epistle* to Vergil. I refer to the famous little poem in the *Anthology* (Riese I, 2, No. 672; Baehrens, IV, No. 183) the authorship of which is attributed to Augustus by the manuscripts. The first three lines are:

Ergone supremis potuit vox improba verbis
 Tam dirum mandare nefas? ergo ibit in ignes
 Magnaque doctiloqui morietur Musa Maronis?

In ll. 27f. we find again the conceit developed as follows:

Si mens [i.e. Vergilii] caeca fuit: iterum sentire ruinas
 Troia suas, iterum cogetur reddere voces!¹
 Ardebit miserae narratrix fama Creusae?
 Sentiet appositos Cumana Sibylla vapores?
 Uretur Tyriae post funera vulnus Elissae
 Et iurata mori, ne cingula reddat, Amazon?

We know that Petrarch was acquainted with this poem. Sabbadini, *op. cit.*, p. 197, Nohac, I, 125, n. 1 and, on the authority of these scholars, Cosenza (Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors [Chicago, 1910], p. 146) cite two allusions. One of these is contained in a marginal note in the *Ambrosianus* apropos of the words of the Servian *Life*, "hac lege iussit emendare," Thilo-Hagen, I, 2, 13; Petrarch commented as follows: super hoc elegantissimo carmine se excusans." Again, in *Opera* 3, p. 90, there is written:

Carmen adhuc superest quo Caesaris atque poetae
 Maiestas studiumque vigent semperque vigeant.

To these two references should be added *Res memor.* 1. 2, p. 396, *Op.*: "nec poeticae expers fuit [Augustus]; extat eius in Virgilium carmen breve quidem sed nec humile nec insulsum." This third citation, previously overlooked, has, for a reason which will soon appear, an importance not shared by the other two. Now, in the humanistic redaction of the *Life* by Donatus (Diehl, p. 33, sec. 58; Brummer, p. 28) ll. 1-3 and 18-22 of the poem are quoted. Sabbadini observes that the manner of Petrarch's references would indicate that he knew

¹ *Poenas*, Vat. 1575, Baehrens; *lucem vel luces?* Riese.

the poem as a whole, hence must have read it in some one of the collections of excerpts now gathered into the *Latin Anthology*. I am glad to indorse this opinion, although I do not place great stress on the tone of Petrarch's citations, in so far as this is exemplified by the two contexts mentioned by Sabbadini and Nolz. In the first instance, it is only an appreciation of the literary merit of the poem that is expressed; this could have been founded on a knowledge of a few lines merely. Furthermore, it must be confessed that it would be quite in consonance with his method of expression to imply that he knew the entire poem, even if he had read only extracts from it. We have seen that he writes as if he had read complete letters of Augustus to Vergil and Horace when, as a matter of strict accuracy, he could at the most have read excerpts only; that he so refers to the letters of Vergil that an unwary reader might surmise that he had read a collection instead of a fragment of one. There are weightier reasons which justify the conclusion that Petrarch knew the poem as a whole and hence derived his acquaintance with it from some other source than the interpolated version of the *Vita*. (1) The existence of the *Donatus Auctus* in its present form cannot be traced back beyond the first quarter of the fifteenth century;¹ Nolz's assertion (I, 124) that Petrarch probably knew the interpolated version cannot be substantiated. As I shall hereafter point out, there is only one instance of parallelism even suggesting dependence by Petrarch on the *Auctus*, and this instance will not stand. (2) The popularity of the poem was great and it was widely disseminated. How numerous the manuscripts are in which it is incorporated a glance at the apparatus cited by Baehrens and Riese in their editions will show. (3) In the passage from *Res memor.*, to which attention is called above, the word *breve*, unlike references to the artistic character of the poem, certainly seems to betoken knowledge of the poem in its entirety.

It is indeed surprising that Sabbadini should assume on one and the same page that Petrarch knew the poem *Ergone supremis*, etc., in its entirety, and should also argue that the words in the Epistle to Vergil actually echo the epigram of Sulpicius. Evidently

¹ Sabbadini, *Le biografie di Vergilio antiche medievali umanistiche*, *Studi Ital. di filol. class.*, XV (1907), 260.

ll. 27-32 of our poem, which have been quoted above, must have escaped Sabbadini's memory, else their claims to consideration as the source of Petrarch's inspiration would not have been overlooked. Credit should be given to Cosenza for avoiding this pitfall. In his note on the lines in the epistle (*op. cit.*, pp. 145-46) he rightly asserts that Petrarch knew the story of the rescue of the *Aeneid* "also from the famous poem *Ergone supremis*," as well as from Macrobius and Donatus, and regards the poem as first in order of importance among the three sources. I cannot, however, accede to the propriety of here according to the *Vita* the standing of a source. Of course, in so doing, Cosenza acted under the spell of the traditional view, to which this article is endeavoring to apply the acid test. He should at all events have taken cognizance of the Servian Life as well, since it is almost as explicit on the subject of the frustration of Vergil's order to destroy the *Aeneid* as is the Life by Donatus. The Servian Life does not contain the epigram of Sulpicius, but admitting, as does Cosenza, the significance of *Ergone supremis* as a source of suggestion to Petrarch, there is no compelling reason to send us beyond the poem and the Servian Life in order to account for everything that we meet in this context of the Epistle to Vergil.

How closely in thought and in motivation Petrarch approaches the poem, will be most apparent if we can bring ourselves to employ for a moment that analytic method to which the pedantic seeker after the well-springs of a poet's fancy often is compelled to resort. Aeneas, says Petrarch, lives in the immortality of the great poem about Aeneas. This is the old motif on which the Roman poets are never tired of ringing the changes; says Tibullus,

Quem referent Musae, vivet dum robora tellus,
Dum caelum stellas, dum vehet amnis aquas,

or, as the author of *Ergone supremis* has it,

Illum, illum Aenean nesciret fama perennis,
Docta Maroneo caneret nisi pagina versu! (ll. 15-16.)

Survivor of the burning of the material Troy, Aeneas was, figuratively speaking, facing death in the flames a second time because of Vergil's condemnation of the *Aeneid*. The hero is saved by the loyal devotion

of his descendant, Augustus, an act which is a replica of the deed of filial piety to which Anchises owed his escape. Augustus did not respect the wishes of the dying poet, nevertheless the verdict of all time will justify this obduracy.

The turn which Petrarch gives to the topos of the second Iliupersis bears far closer resemblance to the treatment accorded to the theme in *Ergone supremis* than to the manner in which the motif is handled in either version of the epigram of Sulpicius or the other pieces in which it figures. The fancy that the leading personalities of the *Aeneid* would be cremated by the flames that should consume the poem is common to Petrarch and *Ergone supremis* alone among all possible sources. In the latter the theme is driven home by the accumulation of exempla—Creusa, the Sibyl, Dido, and Camilla in the received version,¹ in *Recensio* β the last three—all, except the Sibyl, being figures that had met death in the story, hence would, as it were, feel the flames a second time if the epic were burned. In the line devoted to Dido the paradoxical *bis perire* is present, whatever the text we choose. Petrarch adopts this same nuance, but, with a true instinct for effect, heightens the gravity and the pathos of the impending disaster, and emphasizes the service performed for posterity by Augustus, by confining himself to one, and that the most poignant, example of what the destruction of the *Aeneid* would have spelled, viz., the annihilation in the world of fame after his erstwhile narrow escape from a like fate in the world of myth, of the essential character of the poem.

Again, the dominant mood of *Ergone supremis* is apologetic. Augustus is represented in it as pleading for exculpation because he has set at naught the last mandate of a dying man. The defense put on the lips of the Princeps is that the end justified the act, that he observed a higher law (cf. ll. 18 f.), that such a masterpiece as the *Aeneid* deserves immortality. Similarly, Petrarch defends Augustus in a vein that seems unmistakably reminiscent of the tenor of what he regarded as the authentic plea of the Princeps. *Pietas*

¹ Whether Petrarch's text of the poem was that found in most manuscripts and in those which constitute our main reliance today, or belonged to the class of the inferior version, β in Riese's terminology, I cannot presume to say. The chances would favor the former alternative. In any case our arguments are not affected by the uncertainty.

Augusta reads like a conscious rebuttal of the accusation of bad faith which the imaginary critic is anticipated in the poem as bringing. This also is the bearing of the sentence "meritoque supremas contempsisse preces aevo laudabitur omni." In passing, we may note that the verbal resemblance between ll. 27 f. of the better *recensio*, "iterum sentire ruinas Troia suas, iterum cogetur reddere voces? Ardebit, etc.," and Petrarch's "Arsurum iterum . . . secundis flammis" is closer than between the epigram of Sulpicius and Petrarch; we may compare Petrarch's *supremas preces* with *supremis verbis* l. 1, *suprema voluntas* l. 18. We need not, however, lay great stress on similarities in phraseology; common stock of words tends to accompany common stock of ideas. Furthermore, it must always be borne in mind that in the case of a writer such as Petrarch, whose style so frequently reproduces without conscious effort of memory on his part the locutions of the ancient authors with whom he lived, and who prescribed with reference to the ethics and technique of imitation—"curandum imitatori, ut quod scribit simile, non idem sit" (*Famil.* 23. 19, Vol. III, p. 239 *Frac.*)—parallelism in diction is bound to be an elusive thing. The analogies that we have noted in spirit and in motifs yield proof, so far as it is possible to effect a demonstration in an attempt to call back the ghosts of a poet's literary processes, that the famous little poem was the source *par excellence* which suggested to Petrarch the conceit of the second burning, that the context in the *Life* by Donatus has really no claim to consideration as a collateral source, and, certainly, none as an exclusive source.

It may not be amiss, before leaving this topic, to mention an interesting personal application which Petrarch makes of the conceit, although there is nothing in the passage to indicate unequivocally the influence of one source to the exclusion of others. In *De contemptu mundi* 3, p. 365 *Op.*, he tells, how, stricken with a serious illness, he had been tempted to consign to the flames with his own hands his unfinished manuscript of the *Africa*, because he feared that his friends, after the precedent of Vergil's, might play him false. Had he followed this impulse, *Africa*, always scorched by the rays of the sun, and thrice wrapped in flames by Roman torches, would have suffered at his hands another conflagration!

II

My apology for the riot of destructive criticism to which the previous pages of this article have been so largely devoted must be the inchoate stage at which the discussion of the question has been left by our foremost critics in the field of Petrarchan study. Naturally, those pioneers whose task it is to blaze a trail *per una selva oscura* may occasionally fail to exercise the meticulous inspection of the route that those who follow in their footsteps find it comparatively easy to do. By way of supplementing the data thus far presented, I now turn to the consideration of the other passages in Petrarch's works that must challenge the attention of one who is interested in determining the sources from which the humanist derived such knowledge as he possessed of Vergil's life. References by Petrarch to such topics of universal knowledge and widely disseminated mention in the testimonia as Vergil's birthplace, his rustic origin, and the like may be dismissed as indices of no moment. In this same class fall allusions to the literary executorship of Varius and Tucca (*Senil.* 3. 1) to the proposed burning of the *Aeneid* (*Famil.* 20. 12, Vol. III, p. 40 Frac.) where there are forthcoming no precise indications to declare for one source among the several possible sources. I shall confine myself to a review of passages containing biographical information of such a character as fairly to suggest the possibility of contact between Petrarch and some specific source or sources.

In *Famil.* 10. 4, Vol. II, p. 89 Frac., there is, so far as I have discovered, the sole surface reference in Petrarch to a biography of Vergil. That the *Vita* to which reference is made is not the Life by Donatus, but the Servian Life, is a fact of prime importance. Notwithstanding its significance for our question, the passage has not been cited in this connection. In elucidating the symbolism of the eclogue entitled *Parthenias*, Petrarch wrote: "*Parthenias ipse est Virgilius, non a me modo fictum nomen; in vita enim eius legimus quod Parthenias, quasi omni vita probatus, dici meruit.*" Mention of this maidenly surname of Vergil and of the reason of its application to him is found in two of our extant ancient lives of Vergil. (1) In the Suetonian Life, ll. 35-37, we read: "*cetera sane vitae et ore et animo tam probum constat, ut Neapoli Parthenias vulgo appellatus*

sit." (2) In the Life by Servius we find a similar comment, evidently derived from the Suetonian Life: *adeo autem verecundissimus fuit, ut ex moribus cognomen acceperit; nam dictus est Parthenias; omni vita probatus uno tantum morbo laborabat, etc.*, Diehl, p. 41. The presence in Petrarch and in the Servian Life of the locution *omni vita probatus*, by no means the sort of crystallized formula that two writers, independent of each other, would necessarily adopt to express the idea, gives patent proof that Petrarch was here quoting exactly the Servian Life. Noteworthy for us is the obvious fact that he writes as if the Servian Life were for him the canonical biography of Vergil.

A close parallel to the passage from the *Familiares* cited above is to be found in the *Epitome* which Petrarch composed of his Bucolics. Concerning the *Parthenias* he says: "*Istius egloge que prima est in ordine titulus est Parthenias quod nomen interpretatur omni vita probatus. Nam et Virgilius Parthenias vocatus est qui in omni vita probatus in hac egloga primus et principalis pastor introducit;*" see *Scritti inediti di Fr. Petrarca pubblicati ed illustrati da Attilio Hortis*, Trieste, 1874, p. 359. Here also the echo of the Servian Life is plainly discernible. Let us not be too hasty in formulating on the basis of these passages the conclusion that Petrarch had never read the Life by Donatus. We cannot, however, disguise the trend of the evidence which they offer. In former instances we have seen that when the subject-matter was of a type that might conceivably indicate recourse to the Suetonian Life, we were not forced to the decision that this was the source of which he necessarily or probably availed himself. In the present case, under similar conditions, we can demonstrate his entire independence of the Life by Donatus.

A similar deduction may be drawn from a passage in the *Itinerarium*, p. 560, *Op.* Referring to Naples, Petrarch says: "*Haec est civitas ubi Virgilius noster liberalibus studiis operam dedit, cum iam patria illum tua Mediolanum tenerioribus annis discipulum habuisset. Hic se carmen Georgicum scripsisse, hic se ignobili studio floruisse iucundissime¹ memorat. Hanc dulcem vocat ille Parthenopem . . . demum peregre moriens inter extrema suspiria suae meminit*

¹ The text of the Basle edition is *floruisse iucundissime*; the Venetian edition of 1501 reads *floruisse verecundissime*.

Neapolis et huc revehi optavit ut quae vivus amaverat vita fructus incoleret." The tradition that included Naples among the seats of Vergil's education is not found in the genuine redaction of the Life by Donatus; herein are mentioned (ll. 20-24), sojourns at Cremona and at Milan prior to the young poet's departure to Rome. In the Servian Life, on the other hand, we read: "diversis in locis operam litteris dedit; nam et Cremonae et Mediolani et Neapoli studuit." The interpolated Donatus follows the Servian in this detail, inserting after the words found in the genuine version (Diehl, sec. 7), "sed Vergilius a Cremona Mediolanum et inde paulo post," the interpolation: "Neapolim transiit. Ubi cum litteris . . . vehementissimam operam dedisset, tandem omni cura . . . indulsit medicinae et mathematicis . . . se in urbem contulit." We must therefore conclude that it was from the Servian Life that Petrarch derived his information as to Vergil's study at Naples, unless we are prepared to accept as an alternative the view that he used the interpolated redaction of the Life by Donatus. As has been previously pointed out, the present state of our knowledge does not warrant the assumption that the humanistic redaction existed in Petrarch's time. There is, nevertheless, an element in the passage from the *Itinerarium* which might seem to bear on this problem and hence demands a moment's consideration. I refer to the allusion contained in the last sentence to Vergil's devotion to Naples and to his wish to be buried there. It happens that in respect to this detail none of the extant biographies of Vergil stands so close to Petrarch's statement as does the interpolated Life. In section 54 Diehl, there is an insertion that reads thus: "voluit etiam eius ossa Neapolim transferri, ubi diu et suavissime vixerat; ac extrema validudine hoc ipse epitaphion fecit distichon:

Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc
Parthenope: cecini pascua, rura, duces.

Translata ergo iussu Augusti eius ossa prout statuerat Neapoli fuere, sepultaque," etc. Here the fact that it was Vergil's *last wish* that he should be buried at Naples is as explicitly stated as it is by Petrarch. In the corresponding context of the genuine version no direct allusion to an expressed wish is found; we are merely informed

that Vergil was buried at Naples, and the epitaph is quoted. Precisely these elements and no more are present in the account given by the text of the Servian Life utilized by Petrarch.

However, this one instance of parallelism should not lead us to annul the prevalent doctrine, which seems rightly to deny dependence by Petrarch on the interpolated Life. Vergil's fondness for his *dulcis Parthenope* was, of course, known to Petrarch from the concluding lines of the fourth Georgic, partly paraphrased in our passage. The epitaph itself, in which Vergil looks forward to his interment at Naples as *fait accompli*, implies that the poet entertained the wish and anticipated its fulfilment. But, to account for this context in the *Itinerarium*, we are not restricted to speculations, plausible though they be, as to what—given a knowledge of the Servian Life—the powers of inference, the imagination, and the vocabulary of Petrarch might have achieved. Jerome, an author whose works were well thumbed by Petrarch, states directly (*Euseb. Chron.* 1998) what the Servian Life allows to be inferred, that the epitaph was composed by Vergil in his last moments with the expressed anticipation of lying at Naples. Note that Petrarch had merely to embellish the words *quem [titulum] ipse moriens dictaverat*.¹ The trail of the interpolator doubtless leads back to the *Chronicon*, unless we care to hazard the suggestion that he had borrowed from Petrarch the element which both have in common.

We have a more striking instance of reliance on the works of Jerome, in this case for an incident about which the genuine version of the Life would have been as adequate a source of information. In ll. 186 f. is quoted on the authority of the book of Asconius Pedianus, *Contra Obtretractores Vergilii*, Vergil's retort to the critics who accused him of plagiarizing Homer: "sed hoc ipsum crimen sic defendere adsueta ait: 'cur non illi quoque eadem furta temptarent? verum intellecturos facilius esse Herculi clavam quam Homero versum subripere!'" This reply was to furnish to future generations of Vergil's partisans their favorite weapon of defense. Petrarch of course employed it. However, in the case of each of the four allusions or reminiscences that his works contain, it is evident that he has not preserved the point of the anecdote as the Life presents it and that

¹ For passages indicating knowledge of the *Chronicon*, see Nolhac, II, 206, n. 3.

he betrays no acquaintance with that version. Instead, he followed Jerome, who gave the retort a force appreciably different; see *Praef. hebr. quaest. in Genesim*, Migne, Vol. XXIII, col. 983: "Hoc idem passus est ab aemulis et Mantuanus vates, ut cum quosdam versus Homeri transtulisset ad verbum, compilator veterum diceretur. Quibus ille respondit, 'magnarum esse virium, clavam Herculi extorquere de manu.'" Now, it will be observed that in the *Life* Vergil is made rather to emphasize his innocence of the charge, his defense being the sheer impossibility of rifling the treasure house of Homer. Such a procedure is classed among *ādvāra*, of which *Herculi clavam subripere* is a typical formula; cf. Macrobius *Sat.* 5. 3. 16. Jerome gives the story the following color: Borrowing from Homer is cheerfully admitted by Vergil, as an act in itself betokening the possession of superlative poetic power. Examination of the parallel passages in Petrarch will show that he gives only this latter shading: (1) *Famil.* 22. 2, Vol. III, p. 126 Frac.: "etsi enim non me lateat quosdam veterum Virgiliumque ante alios versus innumeros non modo e graeco in latinum versos, ubi abstulisse clavam Herculi gloriatur." (2) *Famil.* 24. 12, Vol. III, p. 298 Frac.: "quae [de Virgilii imitatione] tamen ex ordine ipsis in Saturnalibus scripta sunt, quamvis hoc loco ille suus iocus innotuerit, cui cum obiiceretur ab aemulis quod versus tibi [i.e., Homer] tuos eriperet, magnarum virium esse respondit auferre clavam Herculi;" as Cosenza (*op. cit.*, p. 197) has pointed out, Petrarch confused in memory the contents of the passages in Jerome and Macr. *Sat.* 5. 3. 16 and made a slip in quotation. (3) *Res memor.* 2. 3, p. 419 *Op.*: "nec illepide Virgilius, cum sibi exprobratum esset quod versus Homericos abstulisset et in operis sui congeriem rede-gisset, respondisse traditur magnarum esse virium auferre clavam de manu Herculis, non dissimulans se illis versibus non praecario sed pro suis uti." (4) *Variae* 62, Vol. III, p. 476 Frac.: "solus adversum agmina clavam de manibus Herculis extorsisti." This is evidently a reminiscence of the passage in Jerome; cf. *extorsisti* and *extorquere*.

The treatment accorded by the *Life* to the rubric of Vergil's detractors is conspicuously detailed; see ll. 170-92. In addition to the passages just cited, Petrarch alludes to this topic in the following passages: (1) *Famil.* 1. 1, Vol. I, p. 31 Frac.: "quid Virgilio

maius habuit lingua latina? Reperit tamen ille, qui non poetam sed raptorem alienarum inventionum et translatores diceret. Ipse autem et ingenii fiducia et iudice fretus Augusto, alto animo invidorum verba despexit." (2) *Famil.* 4. 7, Vol. I, p. 217 Frac.: "ipsorum quoque Maronis ac Flacci aetas non aequa tantis ingeniis fuit, quorum alter divini spiritus poeta dum vixit, aemulorum bellis sine fine vexatus, ut alienorum operum deflorator carpitur." In these references to the disparaging criticism directed against Vergil by his contemporaries we can detect primarily the influence of the passage in Jerome. Certain it is that there are no features of content or language that suggest the influence of the Suetonian Life.

In contrast with the too copious data found in the ancient commentators and biographers on the subject of the eviction of Vergil from his farm, Petrarch shows no great interest in this feature of the biographical tradition. In *Famil.* 11. 5, Vol. II, p. 115 Frac., he writes: "Virgilio Augustus Caesar agrum reddiderat sed quem ipse praeipperat." This bare epitome of the traditional account, based on exegesis of the first Eclogue and set forth in detail by Servius in the prooemium to his commentary on the *Bucolics* (Thilo-Hagen, III, 3) offers little that is instructive for our purpose. However, it may be noted that in the Life by Donatus credit for protecting the poet and for active intercession in his behalf is given to Pollio, Alfenus Varus, Cornelius Gallus, and Maecenas. No mention is made of the clemency of Augustus, though naturally he was the final court of appeal. By Servius, just as by Petrarch, the Princeps is explicitly made Vergil's benefactor; cf. Servius, *cit.*: "postea ab Augusto missis tribus viris et ipsi integer ager est redditus, etc."

What Petrarch tells us about the material fortunes in general of Vergil bears no mark suggesting that the Life, with its specific inventory of the poet's property (ll. 40-43), was a source of knowledge. In *De remediis utriusque fortunae* 2. 9, to a list of poor but illustrious Roman men of letters, including Plautus, Horace, Pacuvius, and Statius among poets, Vergil is added: "Inops demum aliquando Virgilius donec praeter suum morem opes ingenio accessere." In *Senil.* 2. 2 we find: "nunquid ergo aut Virgilius multo auro ditatus a Caesare fuit obscurior quam dum rure primo depulsus exul atque inops Romam peteret?" Here also the specific allusion

to Augustus as Vergil's benefactor points to the first *Eclogue*, to Servius on *Aeneid* 6. 861, as we shall see in a moment, a *locus classicus* for Petrarch in connection with another event in Vergil's life and which records the liberal honorarium received for the sixth book of the *Aeneid* as follows: "qui [i.e., Vergil] pro hoc aere gravi donatus est, id est massis." There was also Horace *Ep.* 2. 1. 246 testifying to the bounty of Augustus:

At neque dedecorant tua de se iudicia atque
munera, quae multa dantis cum laude tulerunt,
dilecti tibi Vergilius Variusque poetae.

Another instance plainly betokening ignorance or neglect of the Life by Donatus is furnished by Petrarch's version of the incidents attendant on the famous *recitatio* of the sixth book of the *Aeneid*. In the Life, ll. 109-12, we have the dramatic story of the swoon of Octavia at the words *tu Marcellus eris*; nothing is said as to the emotions aroused in the breast of Augustus. Servius on *Aeneid* 6. 861 paints the scene differently: "et constat hunc librum tanta pronuntiatione Augusto et Octaviae esse recitatum, ut fletu nimio imperarent silentium, nisi Vergilius finem esse dixisset"; there follows the allusion to the reward as transcribed above.

It was evidently to the passage in Servius that Petrarch reverted when penning the following words in *De remediis* 1. 114: "Marcellinus . . . quantum putas expectaretur ab avunculo, qui eum sic dilexit, ut Virgilianum illud carmen nobilissimum . . . sine lacrimis audire non posset et actori silentium imperaret," although, as the reader can discern, he slightly exaggerates the reaction of Augustus. He might, of course, have utilized merely the testimony of this passage as to the poignancy of Octavia's grief for her child. Instead, he preferred to dignify this topic and at the same time to enhance the effect of his exempla by devoting to it a separate allusion based upon a different source. He continues: "quomodo mater Octavia quae illum sic amavit, ut usque ad ultimum vitae suae finem, quasi tunc extinctum, continue deploraret, omnemque consolatorem, non tantum contemneret sed odisset?" In *Variae* 25, p. 389 Frac., and in *Senil.* 10. 4, p. 876 Op., appears similar allusion to the life-long persistency of Octavia's mourning

and to the obduracy with which she refused to be comforted. As comparison will show, underlying these three passages is the same source, viz., Seneca, *Ad Marciam de consolatione* 2. 4: "Nullum finem per omne vitae suae tempus flendi gemendique fecit," etc. Without indulging in the luxury of an *argumentum ex silentio*, I may at least venture to say that it is astonishing that the spectacular appeal and the effectiveness of the anecdote as related in the Life, if Petrarch had ever read it there, did not force it on his memory in connection with some one of these contexts.

In *Epist. metr.* l. 2, Vol. III, p. 90, col. 2 *Op.*, Petrarch alludes to Vergil's laborious methods in composition:

O utinam nostro quondam tam larga Maroni
Copia dicendi! numquam, mihi crede, laborem
Lentus inexpectum seros traxisset in annos.

The time spent by Vergil on his works, the merciless pruning to which at times he subjected them, the deliberation and the capriciousness that in general characterized his literary *modus operandi*, are set forth in the Life by Donatus, ll. 78-90, with considerable detail. In our passage, however, the poet's lack of fluency seems to be an inference resting merely on the fact that the composition of the *Aeneid* was so long protracted. The Servian Life furnishes sufficient testimony that the poem was left without the final revision.

This is the only topic connected with Vergil's literary technique at which Petrarch and the Life by Donatus come in contact. He thrice alludes to Vergil's lack of felicity as a writer of prose, viz., in *Famil.* 4. 15, Vol. I, p. 238 *Frac.*; *Res memor.* 2. 2, p. 410 *Op.* (twice). The source of this assertion is Seneca, *Contro.* 3, p. 243 K, to whom surface reference is made in each of the three instances.

A chapter in the *De vita solitaria* treats of the ancient poets who preferred to live a life apart from "the madding crowd's ignoble strife." Among the exempla Vergil of course finds a place: "Quid Virgilium nostrum loquar? qui fugiens urbem Romam ubi et ingenii laude et toto orbe regnantis principis amicitia florebat ac solitariam libertatem petens, mortem quidem immaturam obviam habuit, quae omnibus eum talibus curis absolveret. Ille sic censebat ope solitudinis opus esse ut divinum illum suum opus posset absolvi" (*De vita sol.* 2. 7. 2, p. 279 *Op.*).

The Life by Donatus recites with greater circumstance than any of our other extant sources Vergil's antipathy toward life at Rome and his preference for a secluded existence in the "provinces," see l. 37: "Romae, quo rarissime commeabat;" ll. 41-44: "habuit . . . domum Romae Esquiliis . . . quamquam secessu Campaniae Siciliaeque plurimum uteretur;" ll. 122-25: "anno aetatis quinquagesimo secundo impositurus Aeneidi summam manum statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare." In this case, at first sight, Petrarch seems more nearly to coincide with the *Vita* than in any of the other instances that I have added to those utilized by Sabbadini. Especially is this true if we are to see in the sentence "ille . . . absolvi" allusion to Vergil's departure to the East, there to put the finishing touches to the *Aeneid*. The Life by Donatus, alone of our extant sources, expresses thus concretely the intention with which Vergil undertook the journey. In Petrarch's exemplar of the Servian Life nothing is said of that desire to revise the *Aeneid* which impelled Vergil to seek new scenes; indeed, the poet's presence in Apulia at the time of his death is quite unmotivated.

Nevertheless, before this passage in Petrarch can be classified as evidence corroborative of the use of the Suetonian Life by him, it is necessary to assure ourselves that what he tells us here must needs point inevitably to that source only. I cannot regard the data as thus definitive. Petrarch did not need the Life by Donatus to inform him that Vergil lived by choice away from Rome. Tradition alone connected the major portion of the poet's life indissolubly with Naples. There were also the concluding lines of the *Georgics*, the devotion to a country life pervading both *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, and voiced as an object of personal longing in *Georg.* 2. 483 f. Petrarch knew from the Servian Life that Vergil died while traveling in Southern Italy. Analysis of the passage in *De vita solitaria* shows that the sentence "ille sic," etc., looks back to the preceding sentence. Here the members *fugiens urbem Romam* and *solitariam libertatem petens* certainly do not justify the assumption that Petrarch could be referring only to the departure from Italy chronicled by the Suetonian Life. His language is not thus restrictive. He had in mind merely Vergil's chronic dislike of life at the capital, his habitual taste

for seclusion, manifested by his fondness for Naples and his residence there, his death while he was visiting places of a bygone greatness, in the idyllic regions of Southern Italy. Such an expression as "in quest of the freedom of solitude" is better applicable to a sojourn in the reposeful country "qua niger umectat flaventia culta Galaesus" than to a journey to the East. The reason assigned for Vergil's retirement—the desire to finish his great epic—is that which above all others would naturally have suggested itself to Petrarch in this connection, intent, as he was, on lauding the advantages of the life lived by the literary recluse, knowing as he did that, in spite of the long years spent in travail apart from "the seats of the mighty," the *Aeneid* was left unfinished.

An item in which there is approximate agreement between Petrarch and the Suetonian Life is the age of Vergil at his death. Compare with ll. 122–25 cited above this passage in *Senil.* 16. 2: "septuaginta [annos] vixit Ennius, totidem Horatius Flaccus; duos et quinquaginta Virgilius nostra etiam aetate breve tempus."

As a matter of fact, Vergil died just before the completion of his fifty-first year—he would have been fifty-one had he lived to the ides of October, 19 B.C. The Life attributed to Probus is that one of the ancient sources that is most precise in this respect: "decessit in Calabria annum agens quinquagesimum et primum." The loose calculation of the Suetonian Life may be the result of carelessness. However, a more plausible supposition is that Vergil, when he started on the journey that was to be his last, was so close to the beginning of his fifty-second year—in modern parlance was so near "fifty-one and going on fifty-two"—that the author of the *Vita* felt justified in disregarding the few weeks intervening. Perhaps, as is likely to be the case in numerical approximations, a round even number had an appeal. Petrarch's "fifty-two years" of course transcends in license even the statement of the *Vita*, yet might conceivably have been based upon it. The question is whether this source furnished the only likely authority for the number adopted by Petrarch.

As a possible alternative, we should think first of all of Jerome's version of the *Chronicon* of Eusebius. This work merely sets down the dates of Vergil's birth and death as they are given in the Suetonian Life, undoubtedly the source from which Jerome derived them. He

did not record the age of Vergil at his death, although he followed this practice elsewhere, in the case of Horace, for example (Migne, p. 440) and Ennius (Migne, pp. 417-18). An exact computation based on the *Chronicon* would not yield the number fifty-two for Vergil's mortal span. Furthermore, the numbers that figure in this passage were not the products of painstaking calculation or of the utilization of annalistic data. Petrarch was clearly drawing on the stores of memory; nor did he after the approved fashion of modern scholarship trouble himself to turn pages in a deliberate effort to verify his recollection. Hence his error of thirteen years¹ in respect to the duration of Horace's life, although the number is given correctly both in the Suetonian Life of Horace and in the passage of the *Chronicon* referred to above.

Have we then in this instance an argument undeniably impressive in favor of the view that Petrarch knew and used the Life by Donatus? Without for the time being appealing to the rather consistent trend away from such a conclusion maintained by the evidence, new and old, which we have thus far examined, we can cite one consideration which, by itself, makes against the absolute cogency of this parallel. The authority of the Suetonian Life had centuries before Petrarch's time conferred a traditional standing on the number fifty-two as the sum-total of the years of Vergil's life. This is shown by the fact that the number was adopted in the imaginary epitaphs of Vergil in the composition of which the poetasters of later years were fond of trying their skill: cf. *Anthol. Lat.*, Baehrens IV, p. 129, ll. 21-24; p. 130, ll. 45-48 = Riese I, 2, Nos. 560, 566; I quote the pertinent distichs:

Ille decem lustris geminos postquam addidit annos
Concessit fatis et situs hoc tumulo est;

Iamque ad lustra decem Titan accesserat alter,
Cum tibi me rapuit, Mantua, Parthenope.

The authors of the epigrams permitted themselves the same liberty of computation that we have noted in the case of Petrarch. There seem to be reasonable grounds for doubting that Petrarch's statement

¹ The *sessanta* of Fracassetti's Italian translation, II, 535, is, I surmise, a slip or a typographical error, not a deliberate correction. The same number cannot be right for both Ennius and Horace, in any case.

was inspired by memory of the sentence in the *Life*—memory, I say, because the passage as a whole does not reveal the results of research and verification. It may well be that he merely set down for the years of Vergil's life the approximation which, established by tradition, had become a commonplace of information with him as well as with the world of learning.

We have now reviewed the passages in Petrarch that furnish points of departure for an attempt to discover whether, as has been universally held, Petrarch knew the genuine version of the Suetonian *Life*, and, if so, to what extent he derived from it such information about the career and the personality of Vergil as he gives us. Concerning the latter question there can be, in the light of the evidence that we have marshaled, no two opinions. In the great majority of the instances that have been examined we have seen that Petrarch turned to the Servian *Life*, to the Commentary of Servius, and to his well-read authors for data which the *Life* by Donatus was equally, and, in some cases, better fitted to supply. Among possible biographical sources the authority of the Servian *Life* is pre-eminent. It is apparent that, if Petrarch had read the Suetonian *Life*, his reliance on it was not even semi-occasional.

I am not without hope that the reader of judicial mind has been persuaded to subscribe to my belief that, in the present state of our knowledge, we are not warranted in assuming that Petrarch used the *Life* by Donatus. At all events, we may justly contend that the current theory has been revealed as resting on supports more tenuous than has hitherto been realized, that such assertions as Nollhac's "*il lisait, en effet, la vie de Virgile attribuée à Donat*" and Sabbadini's "*il Petrarca adoperava certamente . . . la biografia breve di Donato*" would better have been couched in more conservative phraseology. A candid estimate, it is safe to say, would rate highest as indications of acquaintance on the part of Petrarch with the Suetonian *Life* his allusions to the age of Vergil at death, to the letters written by Augustus to Vergil, and, lastly, his knowledge of the couplet of Propertius. In each of these three instances, examined by themselves, we discovered, unless I am oversanguine, reasonable grounds for denying their absolute cogency; the cumulative effect of the evidence as a whole makes potently

against stressing unduly the testimony that they might be supposed to offer in favor of the traditional view.

Of great significance, to my mind, is the fact that, as we have seen, the Servian Life is the only biography of Vergil to which Petrarch directly refers. At a relatively late period in his life he implies that for him the Servian *Vita* was the biography of Vergil. The date of the letter in which the passage in question occurs is, as fixed by Fracassetti, 1348. However, the passage may fairly be regarded as symptomatic of the extent of his knowledge of Vergilian biographies at a later epoch in his life, that is, the five or six years subsequent to 1359 during which he was re-reading and editing his letters for publication. We know that retention of language and subject-matter precisely as they had existed in the original drafts was not a part of his program; he did not hesitate to introduce changes and to make insertions representative of the stages of knowledge and taste to which he had attained in these later years of his life.¹

I must not neglect to mention certain facts of an external nature which form an element in our discussion. The meritorious researches of Sabbadini² have demonstrated that the Life by Donatus in its genuine version was known to friends and contemporaries of Petrarch. Benvenuto Rambaldi, surnamed da Imola, to whom *Senil.* 15. 11 is addressed, derived from ll. 49-50 the authority for the assertion, l. 43, "Virgilius fuerat tardissimus in sermone . . . ut scribit Donatus super Virgilium." The surface reference is a notable exception to the ignorance of the authorship of the *Vita* generally prevalent in the fourteenth century. The works of Boccaccio also seem to reveal acquaintance with the Life³ and he apparently possessed a copy of it, although he did not know it under the name Donatus.

These facts do not by any means enhance the likelihood that Petrarch had perused the biography, even though we grant that he may have known of it by hearsay. It is almost superfluous to point out that the presence of a given monument of ancient literature in

¹ Cf. Sabbadini, "Il primo nucleo della biblioteca del Petrarca," *Rendic. del r. ist. Lombardo*, XXXIX (1906), 369.

² "Le biografie di Virgilio antiche medievali umanistiche," *Studi Ital. di filol. class.*, XVI (1907), 242.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 243-44.

the collections of Petrarch's friends is no proof that he had ever read the work in question. As we know, in the library of Boccaccio were several ancient authors of the first rank, Tacitus and Martial¹ among them, whose works remained closed books to Petrarch, notwithstanding the friendship and the community of intellectual interests that held good between these two leaders of humanism. Boccaccio's acquaintance with the *Appendix Vergiliana* was quantitatively greater than Petrarch's. Hence it should not cause surprise that, even though his coenthusiast in the study of antiquity had a manuscript containing a biography of Vergil more elaborate than the Servian Life, Petrarch should not have had this longer and more detailed biography by him and should not even have read it. The accessibility of the Servian *Vita* and the possibility of supplementing it by the copious material available to him in the works of many of the authors who were the constant companions of his waking hours, may well have tended to satisfy him with what these sources, endowed as they were with the prestige of great names, could teach him about Vergil. We must also bear in mind that in Petrarch's lifetime the authoritative name of Donatus had not been definitely and universally attached to the biography, that in general it remained anonymous until toward the close of the fourteenth century.² Therefore, external data of this character cannot vitiate the conclusions that we have based on internal evidence. Indeed, a set of facts which I have reserved for final consideration comes tantalizingly near to offering welcome corroboration of my belief in Petrarch's ignorance of the Life by Donatus.

As Sabbadini³ has reported, Francesco Nelli, the Simonides who figures so frequently as the recipient of letters from Petrarch, in a letter written to Petrarch in the year 1351 quotes from the Life, ll. 48-49 as follows: "scis quoque, ne iocundum hoc obmittamus, Virgilium semel causam egisse."⁴ Now, on the margin of the manuscript there is the following note, written, as Cochin testifies, in a

¹ Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, pp. 28 f.

² Of the manuscripts listed in Brummer's apparatus, which are anterior to the fifteenth century and contain the Life in full, one only (Parisinus lat. 11308) is by caption connected with Donatus: cf. Sabbadini, *Studi Ital. di filol. class.* XV, 235.

³ *Studi Ital. di filol. class.* XV, 242.

⁴ H. Cochin, *Lettres de Francesco Nelli à Petrarque* (Paris, 1892), p. 182.

hand different from that which appears in the rest of the manuscript: "Non memini me legisse de Virgilio, nisi forte iste vir intelligat Virgilium egisse causam pro possessionibus sibi ablatis et postea restitutis." Apropos of this note the editor comments: "Je n'oserais pas affirmer que cette note soit de Pétrarque." It is tempting, indeed, in the light of our results, to claim the note definitely as the product of Petrarch's pen. However, in the face of Cochin's hesitation and until inspection of the note and its comparison with other specimens of Petrarch's handwriting can be undertaken, dogmatism would be ill-timed. We must rest content with suspicions and with the hope that these may be verified. If I may be permitted to lapse into a personal vein, I should like to say that my conclusions with reference to Petrarch's relation to the Life were formed quite without recourse to the argument suggested by the note.¹ Knowledge of it came merely as agreeable, though not unquestionable, support of a position already assumed. This is certain: The—let me say—scholiast's ignorance of the provenience of the statement in Nelli's letter and his suggestion that it is an inference derived from the first and the ninth *Eclogues* savors strongly of what we have discovered elsewhere as to Petrarch's methods of exegesis, and conforms precisely with the conclusions that we have framed on the basis of the internal evidence.

In the works of Petrarch there are a few other contexts which, although they do not offer evidence pertinent to the issue that has primarily inspired this paper, nevertheless present such interesting problems in respect to the sources of Petrarch's knowledge of the life of Vergil as properly to claim consideration here. The assertions made in these passages are either at variance with the information furnished by the sources on which we have seen Petrarch chiefly relied, or even overstep their testimony. We are thus confronted with the question whether he had access to sources not comprised in our modern apparatus.

In this hypothesis Sabbadini took refuge in order to account for a remark made by Petrarch in *Famil.* 6. 3, Vol. I, p. 324 Frac., to the effect that Vergil became prematurely gray. Such a physical

¹ Cochin's book was not easily accessible to me. I owe to the kindness of my friend Professor N. G. McCrea a transcript of the essential context.

characteristic of Vergil is not specifically mentioned by any ancient source. The passage is: "et Numa Pompilius, cuius supra mentionem feci, prima aetate canus fuit, et Virgilius poeta." Besides this passage cited by Sabbadini there are two others in which Petrarch portrays Vergil as a "good gray poet." (1) In *Senil.* 8. 1 he adds to the *exempla* of Numa and Vergil that of Domitian: . . . "Virgilii iuvenis barba candidior et Domitiani adolescentis coma senescens." Here *barba candidior*, an echo of *Eclogues* 1. 28, gives a plain hint as to the source of Petrarch's notion. (2) In *De contemptu mundi*, dial. 3, p. 803, ed. of 1649, the riddle is solved by Petrarch himself. Commenting on his own gray hairs, he consoles himself by recalling the prematurely silvered locks of Domitian and Numa, then continues: "Nec poeticum defuit exemplum siquidem Virgilius noster in Bucolicis, quae 32 aetatis anno scripsisse eum constat, sub persona pastoris, de se ipso loquens ait: Candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat." Thus we see that it was merely the allegorical identification of Tityrus and Vergil, a theory which ages of criticism more modern than Petrarch's have been slow to relinquish, that lay at the root of his assertion. In this connection it is interesting to see that Petrarch flatly dissents from the note of Servius on this line of the Eclogue. The commentator rejects for this context the supposition that Tityrus equals Vergil, hence suggests "aut mutatio personae est ut quendam rusticum accipiamus loquentem, non Virgilium per allegoriam" or, as an alternative, proposes to couple *candidior* with *libertas*. Thus, to find Petrarch's informant in this instance we are not led beyond the sources that lie within our ken.

The assignment of the composition of the *Eclogues* to Vergil's thirty-second year is a surprising departure from the testimony of Servius as given in the prooemium to the commentary on the *Eclogues*, Thilo-Hagen III, 3, in the note on *Eclog.* 1. 28, and, a third time, in the note on *Georg.* 4. 564. In all these places as well as in the *Life* attributed to Probus, we are told that Vergil was twenty-eight years of age when he wrote—meaning in *lingua scholastica*—began to write the *Eclogues*. Our other data on the chronology of the *Eclogues* are limited to what can be learned from the poems themselves and to the statement found in both the *Life* by Donatus

and the Servian *Vita*, that the composition of the *Eclogues* covered a period of three years.

Owing to the lamentable inaccuracies which disfigure the texts of the greater part of the works of Petrarch, we cannot be certain that we have not to do with a blunder founded on a misread Roman numeral¹ and perpetuated in our editions. On the other hand, if thirty-two be the number that came from the pen of Petrarch, we can but assume another lapse of memory in recalling figures, and a failure to verify. In none of the three passages in Servius is any trace of a variant indicated by Thilo-Hagen. If Petrarch had said that Vergil *finished* writing the *Eclogues* in his thirty-second year, we could conjecture that the computation represented the sum of the twenty-eight years appearing in Servius and the *triennium* recorded in the Servian Life. However, we cannot read this into Petrarch's words, *scripsisse eum constat*, any more than we can into the statement of Servius (Thilo-Hagen, p. 3, l. 26): "sane sciendum Vergilium XXVIII annorum scripsisse bucolica." Furthermore, such a deliberate modification of the number in Servius as this suggestion would presuppose is most unlikely for the reason that it is the smaller number that would by preference commend itself to Petrarch here; the earlier the period in Vergil's life to which the premature grayness can be assigned, the more effective the *exemplum* for Petrarch's purpose. Again, for Petrarch, unversed as he was in the intricacies of the data on which depends the determination of the relative chronology of the *Eclogues*, the first Eclogue would undoubtedly be the earliest in point of time. It was still so regarded by Charles de la Rue in the latter part of the seventeenth century, pioneer though he was in the field of Vergilian chronology.

There is another piece of biographical data, the provenience of which is by no means obvious. In *De remediis utriusque fortunae*, 1. dial. 80, entitled "De eccellente praeceptore," *Ratio*, one of the interlocutors, contends that gifted teachers do not invariably produce great pupils, that genius may attain fruition apart from, or in spite of, formal instruction received from a master. Among the *exempla* are numbered Vergil and Horace: "Nullum Virgilio praeceptorem

¹ In XXVIII, VI might as the result of a blot or of some analogous mishap easily coalesce into a third X.

legimus. Horatius Flaccus de suo nihil, nisi quod plagosum dixit, verberum puerilium, credo, meminerat."

This assertion of Petrarch as to Vergil, the interpretation of which I shall in a moment discuss, has, so far as I have discovered, awakened but a single echo in subsequent biographical criticism. Sebastian Corrado, a professor at Bologna, who died in 1556 and who wrote a biography of Vergil marked, *ut temporibus illis*, by critical acumen and independence of judgment, devoted a few words to a refutation of Petrarch's statement. This biography is to be found in Henri Etienne's editions of Vergil, issued in 1583 and 1599. Its repute lasted until the seventeenth century, as its inclusion in Taubmann's edition, Wittenberg, 1618, testifies. Corrado writes: "nullum praeceptorem Virgilio legimus (inquit Franciscus Petrarca) male: nam Macrobius autor est eum Parthenio grammatico in litteris Graecis usum fuisse: Servius Sironem eius doctorem in rebus Epicureis agnoscit." Corrado's exceptions are well taken; Servius on *Eclog.* 6. 13 and on *Aen.* 6. 264 is authority for the statement that Vergil studied the tenets of Epicureanism under Siro. The passage in Macrobius is *Sat.* 5. 17. 18: "versus est Parthenii quo grammatico in Graecis Vergilius usus est." The clause *quo . . . est*, suspected by Ian and bracketed by Eyssenhardt, appears in all the manuscripts of Macrobius except P, which shows an erasure. It is practically certain, therefore, that Petrarch had read the clause in his exemplar, although this has not, so far as I know, been identified.

It is puzzling to explain how Petrarch came to make an assertion so specifically contradicted by the testimony of authors to whose works he had such constant recourse and knew so thoroughly as he did Macrobius and Servius. Was it again simply a case of *lapsus memoriae*? The other alternative is that he chose deliberately to neglect evidence which he had encountered, if not in two sources with which he was intimately acquainted, then certainly in one. Intent though he was on making out a case for the heaven-inspired, self-taught genius, we can scarcely believe that he would have resorted so far to *ex parte* pleading as gratuitously to suppress evidence conflicting with his thesis. Nothing that we know concerning the spirit and the method of his scholarship justifies so harsh an accusation. If he consciously refrained from taking into account discrepant

testimony, it would rather be that he did not set a high value on it, a supposition which does not accord with his regard for Macrobius and Servius.

If we may judge from the form in which Corrado cast his comment, he understood Petrarch to mean that Vergil had never had a teacher, and that the assertion was based upon a categorical statement to that effect found in some ancient author whose identity was a mystery to the later critic. For he goes on to say: "Nec video quem secutus autorem Franciscus idem Petrarca scripserit Marcellum, Octaviae filium, a Virgilio reprehensum vel irrisum fuisse quod avibus delectaretur." This reference to a fling of Vergil's at a hobby of the young Marcellus is found in *De remediis* 1. dial. 32, p. 106, ed. of 1649. This passage will claim further attention. Corrado's interpretation, or, as I believe, misinterpretation of the sentence "nullum Virgilio praeceptorem legimus," is also indicated by his transposition of the dative to a place following *praeceptorem*. No source known to us contains any such statement about Vergil as Corrado assumed Petrarch to make here.

What we have learned in a recent instance recommends the wisdom of seeking first some other explanation than the hypothesis that Petrarch used biographical sources now lost to us. Let us see if a plausible solution may not lie in a correct understanding of what Petrarch says. Corrado, I believe, failed to grasp the precise shade of meaning that Petrarch intended to convey by the sentence "nullum Virgilio praeceptorem legimus." The literal sense is "we read of no teacher for Vergil," the dative, as, indeed, its intermediate position would show, being dependent on *praeceptorem*. This construction, though more in the form of Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus than that of Cicero, needs no justification, of course. This use of *lego* has, we recall, ample precedent in good authors; cf. Cicero, *De imp. Pomp.* 28; *Pro Marc.* 28; *Cato Mai.* 20; Pliny *Ep.* 7. 19. 7; it is strictly in conformity with the Latinity of Petrarch; see, for example, *Variae* 32, pp. 389-91 Frac.

By interpreting in this way the passage before us we obtain, in my opinion, the most plausible explanation of the genesis of Petrarch's statement. I should assume that he had in mind at the moment of writing, to the temporary exclusion of his other sources, the data

offered by the Servian Life on the subject of Vergil's education. We read there "*diversis in locis operam litteris dedit*," a statement which certainly to Petrarch would have implied that Vergil had undergone a formal training. The name of a teacher is not given. It is easy to see, therefore, how Petrarch could write "we read of no teacher of Vergil," in the *Vita* of the poet, that is, where such an allusion might be expected to occur. It certainly does less violence to the probabilities to surmise that under the spell of his familiar, formal biographical source he forgot contradictory evidence existing in isolated contexts elsewhere, than to hold that he here gave vent to the positive declaration that Vergil had no teacher. Against accepting this alternative view is the fact that this would be the sole instance among all his allusions to Vergil in which a clue to his source resides neither in the traditions nor the literary testimonials known to us. Lastly, exalted as was Petrarch's estimate of Vergil's genius, I find it difficult to entertain the belief that he was capable of regarding the poet as entirely self-made. Such a notion on the part of Petrarch would not square with what he had read in the Servian Life about Vergil's sojourn and study at the academic center of Milan.

Thus far in our enumeration of Petrarch's references to the life and the personality of Vergil, we have not found it necessary to shift our gaze from the figure of the poet as it is sketched in our literary sources. Petrarch's Vergil has been the Vergil of Servius, Macrobius, Jerome—in fine, to adopt the caption of Comparetti, the Vergil of literary tradition. We know in general that Petrarch's conception of Vergil was uncontaminated by the legendary balderdash and the old wives' tales which had attached themselves at Naples to the figure of Vergil. For Petrarch, as his biographers have pointed out, the Mantuan was neither charlatan nor thaumaturge. Petrarch's oft-quoted rejoinder to King Robert of Naples, "*nusquam me legisse magicarium fuisse Virgilium*," is a classic indication of his attitude. One passage, however, seems to lead us away from the beaten paths of the literary tradition. I refer to the story cited by Corrado from *De remediis* 1. 32, to the effect that Vergil scoffed at Marcellus' devotion to birds, or rather, as the context and the title of the dialogue, "*De venatu et aucupio*" indicate, to falconry. The

passage reads thus: "atqui ducum et illustrium multos equis, quosdam canibus delectari solitos audivimus . . . avibus nullum fere: unde et irrisum ferunt a Virgilio Marcellinum, Augusti nepotem, quod dare his operam adolescentulus videretur."

This anecdote, the unique significance of which has been overlooked by students of Petrarch, belongs to a lower stratum than any of the humanist's other allusions to Vergil's career. Corrado, it will be recalled, failed to discover any authority for the assertion. Modern scholarship is not driven to a like confession of inability, for a passage in John of Salisbury, though perhaps not itself the direct source of Petrarch's knowledge of the story, at least paves the way to conclusions. This passage, which both Comparetti¹ and Schaarschmidt² have utilized, is our *locus classicus* of information concerning the famous fly which Vergil is said to have constructed of bronze and set up in Naples as a talisman to rid the city of a plague of flies. See *Polycraticus* 1. 4: "fertur vates Mantuanus interrogasse Marcellum, cum depopulationi avium vehementius operam daret, an avem mallet instrui in capturam avium, an muscam informari in exterminationem muscarum. Cum vero quaestionem ad avunculum retulisset Augustum, consilio eius praelegit ut fieret musca, quae ab Neapoli muscas abigeret et civitatem a peste insanabili liberaret." This story John undoubtedly had heard during one of his visits to Italy; see Schaarschmidt, p. 31. As Comparetti has shown, we have here a tale belonging to the cycle of Neapolitan folk-stories told about Vergil, the great local celebrity. Among other vagaries, the popular legend made Marcellus the duke of Naples and Vergil his prime minister.

The supposition that Petrarch had read the works of John of Salisbury would seem, on a priori grounds, not improbable. Guglielmo da Pastrengo, a correspondent of Petrarch's, cites the *Polycraticus* four times, though without naming the author. Sabbadini,³ on the basis of two indications mentioned by him, assumes Petrarch's indebtedness to the treatise. With the exception of this passage, I am able to contribute no striking case of parallelism, and in

¹ *Virgilio nel medio evo*, 2d ed. (Florence, 1896), II, 36.

² *Johannes Saresberiensis* (Leipzig, 1862), p. 98, n. 2.

³ *Rend. del r. ist. Lomb. di sc. e litt.*, XXXIX (1906), 387.

this present instance Petrarch's version of the story seems rather to separate him from the *Polycraticus*. I should not lay stress solely on the absence of allusion in Petrarch to the talismanic fly. This detail, as smacking of practice of the black art and foreign to his own rationalistic conception of Vergil, he might have been moved to banish from his account, even if the passage in the *Polycraticus* had been the source of his knowledge of the story. But we note that, according to Petrarch, the central point of the incident is Vergil's derision of Marcellus for indulgence in fowling because this was a bizarre pastime, unsanctioned by the approval of the sporting world. This element cannot be read into the account of John of Salisbury. It is simply a case of an option offered in good faith between two gifts, one subserving the interests of the city, the other destined to further the selfish pleasure of Marcellus alone. If John of Salisbury were Petrarch's informant, the original was drastically adapted to point a different moral and to adorn a different tale, or a hazy memory of the version in his source led him to give the anecdote a different turn. The verbal resemblances that are discernible inhere in common locutions.

On the whole, it seems more likely that Petrarch gleaned the story from another source in which the incident was cast in the form in which he has handed it down. We cannot say whether, as John before him, he had heard the story at Naples where tales of this sort were rife, or whether he had come upon it in some wonderbook of the type of the *Gesta Romanorum* or the *Cronica di Partenope*, such as were written to chronicle the deeds of "Master Vergil" in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The significant thing, after all, is that Petrarch in this one instance, but in this one only, did not hold aloof from a story emanating from a domain apart from the classic literary tradition which he ordinarily followed in touching on topics connected with the biography of Vergil.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THE ANTECEDENTS OF HELLENISTIC COMEDY

By HENRY W. PRESCOTT

The possibility, which I have briefly indicated (*CP*, XI, 127 ff.), that certain features of Roman comedy regarded by modern critics as inartistic and Roman in origin were inherent in the Greek originals necessitates a review of the evidence upon which this modern criticism bases its presupposition that Hellenistic comedy is the issue of a great *Kunstentwicklung* in which Euripides was the initiating and controlling force. In such a review I must be content, without pretentious bibliography or detailed analysis, to consider the broad foundations of this theory; the critical question which I have to answer is, how far the interpretation of the technique of Roman comedy must be influenced and determined by known facts regarding the development of the form of comedy in earlier stages of its history.

The study of literary genesis in classical literature seldom leads to convincing conclusions. There are usually tremendous gaps in the evidence. And in the case of comedy, particularly, the disadvantage of fragmentary evidence is increased if one admits, as I must, that whatever validity is attached in general to evolutionary development in literature, comedy is peculiarly exposed, as originally an informal popular entertainment and even in its more artistic form ever *en rapport* with the audience, to influences which promote spontaneous generation and encourage the creation of what the biologists call sports. There is great danger in taking comedy too seriously. The problem forced upon me by the modern interpretation of Roman comedy I should be glad to dismiss in the words which Mother Jaguar addressed to her son when he found difficulty in discriminating two new animals in the woods which, like Euripidean tragedy and Hellenistic comedy, seemed to have lost distinguishing traits by a process of exchange and merger: ". . . the one you said couldn't swim, swims, and the one you said couldn't curl up, curls; and they've gone shares in their prickles, I think. . . ." "Son, son," said Mother Jaguar, ever so many times graciously

waving her tail, "a Hedgehog is a Hedgehog, and can't be anything but a Hedgehog; and a Tortoise is a Tortoise, and can never be anything else." "But it isn't a Hedgehog, and it isn't a Tortoise. It's a little bit of both, and I don't know its proper name." "Nonsense," said Mother Jaguar, "everything has its proper name. I should call it 'Armadillo' till I found out the real one. And I should leave it alone."

I

Mother Jaguar's first contention is practically identical with the view of ancient theorists who, in various Greek documents dating in their present form from the eighth to the fifteenth century A.D., derive Hellenistic comedy from the Old comedy of the fifth century.¹ To them comedy is comedy. The general insistence of ancient literary theory upon comedy and tragedy as independent entities may have blinded these critics to the discovery of modern scholars that this later comedy is not comedy, but merely Euripidean tragedy with comic appurtenances. In any case there are reasons for rejecting the ancient theory, at least in so far as it represents Greek comedy throughout its entire history as primarily devoted to abusive criticism of men and affairs, and as changing the objects and the form of its criticism under the influence of external conditions, political or economic.

Democracy encourages an extreme form of *λοιδορία*; oligarchy represses open criticism. So far as it covers only the Old and the Middle periods of Greek comedy, the political environment of the two periods supports the relative validity of the theory up to this point, even if one finds violent criticism in fragments of Middle comedy and observes that orators of the fourth century are apparently immune in attacking men prominent in public life. But the absurdity of the theory becomes apparent when, as may have been the case, a rigid systematizing led to the extension of this simple political formula in order to cover, consistently with the controlling idea, the different form and content of New comedy; for then the

¹ Kaibel, *Comic. Gr. Frag.*, I, 3 ff. contains the text of these documents. References to Kaibel, without further definition, are to the pages and the marginal numbering of lines of this edition. For a critical study of sources, cf. Kaibel, "Die Prolegomena ΠΕΡΙ ΚΩΜΩΔΙΑΣ," *Abhandl. götting. Gesell.*, II/4 (1898).

ancient critics were driven to the extreme contention that in New comedy abusive attack was directed against slaves and foreigners. It is quite evident from the remains of New comedy and from the Roman adaptations that the poets of this later period were innocent of any malicious designs upon slaves and foreigners; the political systematizer has selected these two categories out of the many characters represented in the plays of New comedy, because they furnish a direct antithesis to the rich freemen and influential citizens who, according to the same theory, were subjected to violent criticism in Old comedy. At this point, therefore, ancient critics become purely rhetorical. One may, however, still insist on the plausibility of the general notion if it is limited to Old and Middle comedy, and may regard the weakness as mere botching, by some later hand, of a theory that was reasonable when first presented, perhaps in the course of the fourth century, as an explanation of the differences between Old and Middle comedy.¹

By this shift from explicit criticism to veiled attack and innuendo ancient theory accounts for essential changes in content; development in form it relates particularly to the gradual elimination of the chorus. The statement of the case in Platonius² is blurred and inaccurate. He mentions the defect of *choregoi* and the consequent omission of parabases and *chorika mele* in close connection with his statement of the limitations of free speech under an oligarchy. A clearer statement of the case, in accord with probability, might explicitly relate the diminished importance of the chorus to this suppression of frank criticism, for the chorus as the main instrument in the expression of lampooning attacks on individuals and public policies would necessarily lose its function so soon as outspoken criticism was checked, and would ultimately disappear unless it could acquire a new and equally essential function. But Platonius leaves this important consideration implicit in the context and explicitly refers the diminished rôle of the chorus to financial exigency, resulting apparently from the Peloponnesian War. Consistently, in point of date, he mentions as an example of comedies produced under these conditions the *Aiolosikon* of Aristophanes,

¹ Kaibel, "Die Prolegomena," 48 ff.

² Kaibel, 4/21 ff., and repeated in different form 5/45 ff.

and inaccurately includes, as if of the same date, a mythological travesty by Cratinus, the *Odusses*, which was probably exhibited as early as 440-38; and he explicitly refers this shift from lampooning comedy to mythological travesty, in respect to content as well as to form, to the necessity of diverting criticism from men and affairs to literary material as found in mythological tragedy. A mythological travesty without parabases and *chorika* he represents to be typical of Middle comedy.¹

In my opinion this part of Platonius' statement is a plausible theory, if one revises the form of his expression in accord with known facts and conceivable conditions, correcting his obvious error and emphasizing what he left implicit. Such a revised statement might run thus: Old comedy in the fifth century was devoted mainly to satirical criticism of prominent men. At intervals and temporarily from the middle of the fifth century on this outspoken criticism was checked;² on such occasions the playwrights often resorted to mythological travesty, and the chorus, as the main instrument of satirical attack, dropped into the background. At the turn of the fifth century, when free speech was more effectually suppressed, these mythological comedies, approximately chorusless, emerged as the dominant type of comedy; so that what was occasional and temporary in the case of Cratinus' *Odusses* became normal in the later years of Aristophanes' career and in the productions of Plato and of the earlier poets of the Middle period. That a more reasonable exposition of the theory once existed in Greek documents is suggested by the form which it assumes in Latin documents presumably Greek in origin. A more explicit statement of the case for the chorus, for example, is made by Horace (*A. P.* 283): "chorusque turpiter obticuit sublato iure nocendi." And the theory in the large appears

¹ It is not clear that Platonius intended to indicate the complete removal of the chorus from the plays that he regards as anticipating the Middle comedy; for some mythological plays the chorus seems to be well authenticated, and for its retention in the Middle period cf. Capps, *AJA*, X (1895), 303 ff.; *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, XXXI (1900), 133; Koerte, *N. JHBB. f. d. kl. Alt.*, V (1900), 81 ff.

² The extent of this repression in the fifth century, the legal procedure involved, the particular kind of criticism prohibited by the legal procedure, are all matters of dispute; for discussion and full bibliography cf. Kalinka, *Die Pseudoxenophontische ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ*, pp. 7 ff., and his commentary on II. 18; also Starkie, in his edition of the *Acharnians*, excursus II, pp. 243 f.

in a more rational form in the Latin versions of Evanthius,¹ Diomedes,² and the *Liber Glossarum*.³ Here the absurdity of slaves and foreigners as objects of attack in New comedy is replaced by more discreet generalizations in which New comedy is described as a portrayal of private life devoid of malicious criticism.

II

Acceptable as this revised version of the ancient theory might be, it would have only the validity of partial truth; for it is demonstrable that the exponents of this theory not only committed errors, but omitted an essential amount of evidence that might well have contributed to an understanding of the transition from Old to Middle comedy. For in many of the Greek documents, with remarkable consistency, the individual poets who serve as illustrations of the normal type of comedy in the Old period are Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes—these three and no more.⁴ The concentration upon this famous triad of scurrilous poets is much earlier than the Greek documents in question; for the phrasing in passages of Horace,⁵ Quintilian,⁶ and Velleius⁷ clearly indicates that these three poets had come to stand quite exclusively as representative of Old comedy, at least as early as the first century B.C.

We have, however, unassailable evidence that there existed in the fifth century, quite apart from these and other scurrilous poets, a distinct type of comedy differing in form and content from the scurrilous plays usually cultivated by this triad of poets. Aristotle, in his *Poetics* (1449b), having previously stated the successive changes in tragedy, professes ignorance of corresponding changes in comedy. Comedy was informal; it was officially recognized only late in its development and had already assumed definite form at the time when individual poets were recorded in the official reports of dramatic contests. In the midst of this frank confession of ignorance, however, Aristotle asserts positively that the invention of plots originated in

¹ Kaibel, 64/66 ff.

² *Ibid.*, 58/166 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, 72/15 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 3/3, 3/12, 6/73-90, 15/70, 58/165, 62/23; also Ps. Dionys. *Ars rhet.* 57.19 Usener; cf. Kroehnert, *Canonesque poet. script. artif.* . . . fuerint, Königsberg (1897), 27.

⁵ *Serm.* i. 4. 1; cf. Persius i. 123 ff.

⁶ x. 1. 66.

⁷ i. 16. 3.

Sicily and was introduced into Athens by Crates, who was the first of the Athenians to abandon scurrilous comedy and to generalize themes or plots.¹ There can, I think, be no reasonable doubt that Aristotle in this passage is conscious of the antithesis between the comedy of his own day and the Old comedy. The general context indicates a close relation between the iambographs and the poets of Old comedy, who have in common the *ιαμβικὴ ἰδέα* and *λοιδορία*. To Aristotle the generalized comedy of his own day is opposed and superior to this scurrilous comedy (cf. *Poet.* 1451b; *Eth. Nic.* 1128a. 22), and by implication he is finding in Epicharmus and Crates the earlier background of the generalizing tendencies of Hellenistic comedy and its unity of plot as contrasted with the incoherent satirical burlesque usually cultivated by poets of the Old comedy. The great difficulty lies in our determining from such a general statement and from fragmentary evidence of the content and form both of Sicilian comedy and its issues in the hands of Crates and Pherecrates² just what progress, if any, had been made near the middle of the fifth century toward either the non-scurrilous mythological travesty of the Middle period or the well-organized comedy of manners that we find ultimately in the Roman adaptations of Greek models, most of which were probably post-Aristotelian in date.

From the tantalizing array of titles and fragments of Epicharmus' plays³ one fact immediately emerges: more than half of the thirty-six extant titles point to mythological themes. It is, of course, a negative fact of doubtful significance that the fragments contain no evidence of scurrilous attacks on individuals, but the Doric farce

¹ τὸ δὲ μύθους ποιεῖν Ἐπίχαρμος καὶ Φόρμις· τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ Σικελίας ἦλθε· τῶν δὲ Ἀθήνησιν Κράτης πρῶτος ἤρξεν ἀφέντος τῆς ἱαμβικῆς ἰδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους. (Cf. Themistius *Or.* 27. p. 406 Dind.) Changes proposed in the text of Aristotle do not affect the passage for our purposes. On the interpretation of *λόγους καὶ μύθους* cf. Vahlen, *Sitzb. d. kais. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien* (phil.-hist. Cl.), L (1865), 295-98; and for a summary of various modern interpretations of the passage cf. Behaghel, *Gesch. d. Auffassung d. aristoph. Vögel*, II, 6, n. 2.

² An anonymous treatise on the poets of comedy, after characterizing Crates, says of Pherecrates (Kaibel 8/33): . . . ἐξήλωκε Κράτην καὶ αὐτὸν μὲν λοιδορεῖν ἀπέστη, πράγματα δὲ εἰσηγούμενος καὶνὰ ὑπόδοκμει, γενόμενος εὐρετικὸς μύθῳ.

³ The extreme skepticism regarding Epicharmus and his work (Wilamowitz, *Textg. d. gr. Lyriker*, 24 ff.; GGA [1906], 621 ff.; Fraenkel, *de med. et nov. com. gr. quæst. sel.* [Göttingen, 1912], 78, n. 1) seems to me quite unwarranted; cf. Körte, *Burs.-Jahresb.*, CLII (1911), 231.

from which Sicilian comedy is supposed to develop and the political environment of Epicharmus do not provide a background for lampooning comedy such as Athens cultivated in the atmosphere of the carnival-komos.¹ It is quite possible that to Athenians of Crates' time the mythological plays of Epicharmus furnished a sharp antithesis to the lampooning burlesques of Cratinus. And not only in content but in form; for mythological themes, whether derived from oral tradition, epic poetry, or tragedy, have already been organized for the comic poet, in earlier popular or literary tradition, with a degree of coherence and unity that would stand in striking contrast with the inorganic satirical drama of Athens in the fifth century. In brief, the conditions provide for a direct line of descent from the mythological plays of Epicharmus through occasional Athenian vagaries like the *Odusses* of Cratinus to the mythological travesty that dominated the comic stage at Athens in the later days of Aristophanes and in the time of Plato and his immediate successors. And not only the relative coherence of mythological plot, but the absence of a chorus from the plays of Epicharmus, so far as the fragments negatively attest, provide the requisite background for both the chorusless Hellenistic type and for an intermediate form in which a chorus, relatively inactive, perhaps appeared with an entrance song, but denied itself parabasis and regularly recurring *chorika mele*, as Platonius seems to assert and as the present text of the *Plutus*² may serve to illustrate. Such an intermediate form may have been a compromise between the Sicilian and the normal Attic form of comedy, leading the way to a chorusless type of play in the New, if not in the Middle, period.

But, although known facts and conditions could be harmonized with such a theory of historical continuity in the development of a

¹ Non-scurrilous comedy, in the sense in which I use the term, does not necessarily avoid satirical attacks upon social and political groups or implicit attacks on individuals, but does eliminate explicit lampooning of governmental policies and individuals, particularly those prominent in public life. So, for example, Epicharmus may attack the soothsayers (frag. 9, cf. Rhinthon frag. 17 Kaibel), and even in Sicilian mime, under the direction of the tyrant Dionysius, Xenarchus may lampoon the citizens of Rhegium (Xenarchus frag. 2 Kaibel). Similar attacks upon social and political groups frequently recur in Hellenistic comedy.

² On the *Plutus* as a "neoterizing" comedy, cf. *Vita Aristoph.* (Van Leeuwen, *Proleg. ad Aristoph.*, p. 173) and the critical apparatus of Kaibel 18/30.

non-scurrilous mythological comedy, it would be difficult from extant evidence to resolve plausible theory into incontestable fact. And even if mythological comedy in the Middle period were satisfactorily accounted for by such reasoning, a coherent comedy of manners, sentiment, and intrigue such as emerges in the Middle period and becomes dominant in the New period would still remain unexplained. Of course, as a mere statement of possibility, it is reasonable to assert that mythological comedy offers an opening for the development out of itself of a comedy of manners, sentiment, and intrigue; for the travesty of the gods and heroes of myth is most easily effected by reducing these supernatural beings to the level of ordinary human creatures and by subjecting them to the experiences of everyday life; mythological comedy had probably anticipated Euripides in humanizing gods and heroes.¹ Yet the development of a comedy of manners from such a source would seem somewhat forced and roundabout if the rudiments of a comedy of manners existed in the germs which, transferred to Sicily and Southern Italy from the Peloponnesus, Epicharmus and others may have developed in his artistic rehabilitation of earlier Dorian elements. It should, however, be expressly stated that any attempt to reconstruct a comedy of manners from what we know of Epicharmus, Crates, and Pherecrates is bound to result merely in the accumulation of a number of facts, each weak in itself, and many of them resting upon somewhat dubious hypotheses. The difficulty of differentiating the character-

¹ Mythological comedy may of course be political, as Cratinus' *Dionusalexandros*, *Nemesis*, and *Drapetides* attest, but in such cases innuendo rather than explicit attack seems to have been the rule; and general social satire was always available in mythological comedy. On the other hand, Plautus' *Amphitruo* may suggest how easily a mythological comedy approaches a comedy of manners, and how fully some myths provide the essential themes of intrigue, sentiment, confusion of identity. It is probable that mythological comedy provided a rich variety of form and content. The handling of the myth in Cratinus' *Dionusalexandros*, as we now know from the hypothesis, illustrates the comical perversion of the story, while the *Amphitruo* shows how closely the travesty may keep to the myth, expanding simply the theme of confused identity. And as regards form, though the chorus in Athenian mythological comedy may have been relatively inactive in some cases, yet it seems to have maintained its function in other cases, as the hypothesis of the *Dionusalexandros*, again, perhaps attests. In brief, though I think I may safely refer to mythological comedy as non-scurrilous in the Aristotelian sense, I do not intend to ascribe any uniformity in content or form to the type; it furnished an opportunity for mitigating or avoiding personal attack. A complete and orderly synthesis of the attainable facts regarding the form and content of mythological comedy is much desired.

istics of Sicilian comedy in general is due, not merely to the scantiness of material evidence, but to the fact that Sicilian comedy and Attic comedy, in the opinion of many modern scholars, were both dependent upon Doric farce, the former being an embellished form of Doric farce, the latter a combination of Doric farce with an indigenous Attic element, the *komos*-chorus. If these modern views are correct, even Aristophanic comedy is likely to reveal some features that appeared in the plays of Epicharmus;¹ and if we are searching for a non-scurrilous type of Old Attic comedy that existed before and alongside of Aristophanic comedy, but distinct from most of it in form and content, it becomes peculiarly hazardous to stress the broad characteristics of Doric farce as possibly continued through Epicharmus, Crates, and Pherecrates to the time of the Middle comedy and later. Only the precise statement of Aristotle leads me, with this admission of the difficulty and the hazard, to emphasize in the evidence of Doric farce, of Epicharmus, and of Crates and Pherecrates those features which conceivably might foreshadow distinguishing traits of a comedy of manners in the Middle period.

Doric farce in the Peloponnesus may well have been hardly more than a loosely connected series of scenes, a compromise between mime and drama.² The statement in Athenaeus 621d, on the authority of Sosibius, regarding an early Spartan *παιδιά* performed by a *dikelistes* suggests mime rather than fully developed drama; and the scenes briefly covered under the captions "men stealing fruit" and "a foreign physician," with a quotation from a comedy of Alexis in the Middle period to illustrate what a foreign physician might say in such a *παιδιά*, may have been independent mimes rather than parts of a larger play. The bracketing of "men stealing fruit" with a foreign physician weakens the force of the passage for our purposes, but the physician as a character,³ the implied differentiation of foreign and native professional types, and the use of a passage of Middle comedy for illustrative purposes should at least arrest the

¹ Cf. von Salis, *de Doriensium ludorum in comoedia Att. vestigiis*, Basle, 1905.

² Cf. Thiele, *N. JHBB f. d. kl. Alt.*, IX (1902), 411 ff.

³ The passage of Alexis seems to point to the use of dialect, whether native or professional; a physician is generally supposed to be the speaker in Crates, frag. 41, and there uses Doric; cf. von Salis, *op. cit.*, 22 f.; the physician appears in late mimes according to Choricus V. 4 (*Rev. de phil.*, I [1877], 212).

attention of anybody who is searching for possible anticipations of the professional types of Hellenistic comedy in earlier dramatic forms. In harmony with this evidence of professional types and also of the discrimination of foreign and native rôles stands the statement regarding masks used in the farce of Peloponnesian Megara: a native and a foreign cook were provided with distinguishing masks and type-names, Maeson and Tettix.¹ Whether these and other professional types,² if there were such, were taken over by Epicharmus from his home in Peloponnesian Megara to his Sicilian habitat and there developed in a comedy of manners, we have no means of knowing. There is hardly valid evidence, but only a priori assumption that any plays of Epicharmus were comedies of types, of manners, of private life, such as we find in the Hellenistic period.

We must certainly beware of ascribing to Epicharmus any strict uniformity in the content and form of his dramatic poems;³ the general word "comedy" is improperly applied to them; some of them may have been mimes. Among these mimes probably belong the "debates," *Γὰ καὶ Θάλασσα* and *Λόγος καὶ Λογίνα*; these titles do not suggest anything more than a dramatized debate constituting the whole of a dramatic poem. We have no reason to suppose that the two debates were smaller parts of a larger drama and corresponded to the *agones* of Aristophanic comedy; such debates, however, might easily become parts of a larger whole, and one may properly find analogues, not in the *agones* of Aristophanic comedy, but in the

¹ For the evidence and discussion, cf. Kaibel 76; Schneidewin, *Coniect. crit.*, 120 ff.; Rankin, *The Rôle of the Mageiroi*, etc., 13 ff.; Robert, *Die Masken d. neuer. att. Komödie*, 12 ff., 71 ff. The comic effects secured by Cratinus in his *Odusses* may be due to a fusion of the *mageiros* and of the epic Cyclops (cf. Tanner, *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, XLVI [1915], 176).

² Modern scholars usually find the background of the professional types of Hellenistic comedy in corresponding figures in the episodic scenes of Aristophanic comedy. So far as professional rôles in later comedy are often inorganic, there is some analogy, but as regards the particular professional types employed, the cook, physician, and parasite of Doric farce and Epicharmus offer a more precise background than anything in Aristophanes. The passage of Athenaeus (659a) which seems to refer to Megarian farce the mask of the cook also mentions a mask of a *θεράπων*. The slave is too general a rôle to be used for discriminating varieties of comedy, though the Phluax-vases may provide evidence for Doric farce (von Salis, *op. cit.*, 23 ff.). It is the slave who makes comedy out of tragedy according to the prologue of the *Amphitruo*; it is interesting to find him emerging into the foreground in the later plays of Aristophanes; on his rôle in Old comedy cf. Zuretti, *Riv. di filol.*, XXXI (1903), 46 ff.

³ Cf. Thiele, *op. cit.*, 418, who argues more from titles than I should venture to do.

discussion between the two *Δόγοι* in the *Clouds* and in a faded form in the implied opposition of Wealth and Poverty in the *agon* of the *Plutus* (487 ff.).¹ Among these debates of Epicharmus there is no valid reason for including the *Ἑλπίς ἢ Πλοῦτος*; neither the title nor the fragments indicate the nature of the piece; from it are quoted the only fragments that may bear upon professional rôles in Epicharmus. These two fragments (34, 35) are spoken by a character whom Athenaeus (235e) describes in the words: "Carystus the Pergamene, in his work *Περὶ διδασκαλιῶν*, says that the parasite, as we now call him, was first invented by Alexis, forgetting that Epicharmus introduced him in his *Ἑλπίς ἢ Πλοῦτος*." Accepting the correction, we note again the *post hoc* in the combination of Epicharmus and Alexis corresponding to the quotation of Alexis in Athenaeus 621d to illustrate what the foreign physician in Doric farce might say.² In the second place we must observe that Athenaeus' statement implies that Epicharmus did not call the character a parasite;³ nor have we evidence that the parasite, under that name, existed in contemporary society. Thirdly, as regards technique, we should not overlook the fact that Athenaeus distinctly says that the character in speaking these verses was answering inquiries—that is, the speech was not in the form of monologue as corresponding speeches of parasites in Hellenistic comedy are likely to be; nor can we determine the

¹ Cf. the same opposition in Pherecrates' *Persai*. The debates in Epicharmus seem to me to be peculiarly rhetorical, as we might expect them to be in the home of rhetoric. The figures in the debate are abstract. The immediate issues and connections are to be found in the pastoral debate, in Callimachus' poem on the contest between the olive and the laurel, in the *Mortis et Vitae Iudicium* and *Cocus et Pistor*. The vigorous action and the live questions involved in Aristophanic *agones* might have developed, under the special conditions of Athenian life in the fifth century, from the placid debates of Epicharmus, but I should more easily admit a common origin of the two things than a development directly from mere debate into *agon*; such a common source might perhaps be found in the religious practices discussed by Usener, *Archiv f. Religionswiss.*, VII (1904), 297 ff., 313. Conceivably, *Luxuria* and *Inopia* in the prologue of Plautus' *Trinummus* are a much faded relic of the debate in Epicharmus, and abstractions like *Agnōia* and *Aurilium* in the prologues of New comedy may weakly reflect the interest of Epicharmus in allegorical figures instead of being merely casual variations of the usual divinity-prologus. Sieckmann's extravagant theory of the debate in Epicharmus (*de com. Att. primordiis*, Göttingen, 1906) is exploded by Süss, *BPW* (1907), 1377.

² On the general connection between Alexis and Epicharmus cf. Kaibel in *PWRE*, I, 1470.

³ But cf. Giese, *de parasiti persona* (Berlin, 1908), 5, n. 1.

organic relation of the speaker to the rest of the action. But with all these reservations the fragments which Athenaeus quotes, and especially frag. 35, put in the mouth of the speaker many of the stock themes of the later parasite, as ἄκλητος, γελωτοποιός, κόλαξ, and poverty-stricken, returning after the banquet besotted and unattended, mauled by the police, to his rough shake-down.¹ If the character in Epicharmus played only such a rôle as the parasitic slaves of Demos in Aristophanes' *Knights*, or the parasites of Eupolis' *Kolakes*, or of Aristophanes' *Tagenistai* he loses much of his significance for our present purpose, but in view of Aristotle's statement we are justified in pointing out the possible import of the two fragments.

The evidence of a comedy of manners in Sicily is not increased by consideration of the extant titles of Epicharmus' plays. One may often identify mythological comedy and the debate in Epicharmus by the title, but a supposition that the *Agrostinos* or the *Megaris*² is necessarily a comedy of private life can never with our present material be more than idle hypothesis. A vague argument from probability may be easily constructed by anybody who notes the obvious portrayal of private life in contemporary mimes of Sophron, or who cares to stress the scenes from private life often recognizable in the Phluax-vases of Southern Italy, assuming that these reflect a form of Doric farce which Epicharmus himself elaborated;³ and one may fairly observe that the Atellan play in Italy, with its obvious points of contact with Hellenistic comedy, is supposed by many modern scholars to have developed from the same elements of Doric farce which were incorporated in the Phluakes and embellished by

¹ For parallel themes in Hellenistic comedy, cf. Giese, *op. cit.*, 8, nn. 1, 2. That Crates frag. 3 was spoken by a parasite is merely an interesting guess, particularly interesting because the fragment is from the *Geitones*, in which (cf. below p. 420) Crates, after Epicharmus, exhibited drunkards on the stage. There is some general resemblance between Epich. frag. 35 and the epigram of Posidippus on the parasite which I have interpreted in *CP*, V (1910), 494 ff., so far as the difficulties of the homeward journey are concerned. For an extremely skeptical view of the evidence, cf. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, 78, n. 1.

² Having no faith in titles as evidence, I refer to von Salis, *op. cit.*, 51 ff. for a list of titles which Epicharmus has in common with poets of later comedy.

³ The contrary view that the vases, being from the third century, illustrate a drama influenced by Hellenistic comedy would vitiate such evidence.

Epicharmus.¹ In general, it would facilitate our understanding of Hellenistic comedy and its background if we were in a position to prove that back of Epicharmus and of the Atellan play and of the Phluakes lay mythological and biological mimes which the Sicilian poet had developed from isolated or loosely connected scenes into coherent plays of manners and mythology, perhaps shorter in compass than the plays of either Old or New comedy. But of the mime in any early period it is difficult to recover clear traces, least of all to discern what relation it bore to the comedy, whether Dorian or Attic, which so often shows traits in common with it. Personally I find it difficult to regard as purely casual and accidental the transition which Athenaeus makes to his account of the beginnings of comedy, particularly of the mimic entertainments of the Spartan *dikelistes*. The whole passage, it will be remembered, is imbedded in an account of musical entertainments. Before passing to the *κωμική παιδιά* of the Spartan *dikelist*, as described by Sosibius, Athenaeus, discussing the musical mime, quotes Aristoxenus for the assertion that *τὴν μὲν ἱλαρωδίαν σεμνὴν οὔσαν παρὰ τὴν τραγωδίαν εἶναι, τὴν δὲ μαγωδίαν παρὰ τὴν κωμωδίαν*, and continues: *πολλάκις δὲ οἱ μαγῶδοι καὶ κωμικὰς ὑποθέσεις λαβόντες ὑποκρίθησαν κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀγωγὴν καὶ διάθεσιν*. Then briefly explaining the etymology of *μαγωδία*, he passes at once to the *κωμική παιδιά* of Sparta and ultimately to the heckling phallic chorus from which Aristotle derives Attic comedy. Magody is Ionic rather than Doric, but it is only a form of the pan-Hellenic mime and the rôles which the magodist assumed, *ὑποκρινόμενος ποτὲ μὲν γυναικας [καὶ] μοιχοὺς καὶ μαστροποὺς, ποτὲ δὲ ἄνδρα μεθύοντα καὶ ἐπὶ κῶμον παραγινόμενον πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην* bring us into the range of characters and materials that would help much toward a reconstruction of the background of Hellenistic comedy, if we could once demonstrate that any of the plays of Epicharmus, contemporary of Sophron, were variously developed forms of the mime.² But as it is, the titles of Epicharmus' plays

¹ Cf. Marx, *PWRE*, s. v. Atellana.

² As Hiller has pointed out (*Rh. Mus.*, XXX [1875], 72) one should not hastily infer from Aristoxenus that magody developed later than the comedy with which it has characters and themes in common. The post-Christian remains of mime are always open to the charge of being influenced by comedy, but they read like popular, unliterary productions. The *certamen* between sailors on river boats and sailors on

lend greater plausibility to a theory of the influence of mythological than of biological mime.

With substantial evidence of a mythological comedy in Sicily and hardly more than vague surmisings of a comedy of manners we turn to Crates and Pherecrates. The scanty evidence of their dramatic work only negatively supports Aristotle's statement; the fragments are devoid of scurrilous attack; the titles are often non-committal, but they certainly suggest no emphasis upon mythological subject-matter and only by the incautious may they be used to demonstrate a comedy of manners. But outside the unknown and unknowable of titles and fragments there lies a tangible bit of evidence that seems to corroborate in a general way Aristotle's sharp discrimination of Crates' work from the less organic scurrilous comedy of the fifth century. In the notable document which Aristophanes gives us in the parabasis of the *Knights*, recounting the history of comedy down to his own day, the characterization of Crates, following the account of Magnes, with his interest in fantastic plays, and of Cratinus as the browbeater of contemporary wrongdoers, is highly significant in comparison with Aristotle's statement. Unfortunately Aristophanes' mysterious figurative language is as tantalizing as Aristotle's broad generalization; yet the two statements are, in a somewhat negative sense, harmonious. Crates, according to Aristophanes,¹ served a lunch to the audience at slight expense; he fashioned the neatest conceits in the driest style.² His reward was the wrath of the audience and hard knocks; yet *he* single-handed held his ground, sometimes failing, sometimes succeeding. Naturally

ocean-faring vessels, the opposition of sober man and drunkard, in late mimes are in spirit and form, though not in time, near the debates of Epicharmus (cf. the fifth edition of Crusius' Herondas 134-39). And the *Charition* (Crusius, *ibid.*, 101 ff.) should be more significant to any student of Hellenistic comedy than Euripides' *Iph. Taur.* and *Helena*.

¹ οἷας δὲ Κράτης ὀργὰς ὑμῶν ἠνέσχετο καὶ συφελίγμων,
ὅς ἀπὸ μικρᾶς δαπάνης ὑμᾶς ἀριστίζων ἀπέπεμπεν,
ἀπὸ κραμβοτάτου στόματος μάττων ἀστειοτάτας ἐπινοίας·
χοῖτος μέντοι μόνος ἀντήρκει, τότε μὲν πίπτων τότε δ' οὐχί [537-40].

² On the interpretation of ἀπὸ κραμβοτάτου στόματος μάττων I have no convictions, but whether the adjective is connected with κράμβη, of a plain fare, or with κράμβος, of a dry style, the phrase reinforces the meaning of ἀριστίζων; for various views, compare, not only the commentators, but Wilamowitz, *Antigonos von Karystos*, 96, and the recent suggestions discussed by Körte, *Burs.-Jahresb.*, CLII (1911), 293.

the interpretation of the passage is much disputed. A possible clue to the main thought is contained in Aristophanes frag. 333,¹ in which Crates is caricatured again for what we may suspect is an example of his "conceits" (cf. Crates frag. 29), and the adverb *ἀπὸνως* seems to be applied with a suggestion of the slight outlay of intellectual effort which, from Aristophanes' standpoint, was expended by Crates in his comedies. To this meager mental expenditure, I think, Aristophanes refers in the "lunch at small expense" in the *Knights*. But that Aristophanes has in mind a tamer non-scurrilous comedy which, as compared with the virulent abuse in Cratinus, seems to him a lunch at slight expense is by no means clear; he may be referring only to such details of Crates' plays as he attacks in frag. 333, in which, apparently, a mere phrase or conceit of Crates is ironically handled in figurative language that is not unlike the figure employed in *Knights* 538.² The value, therefore, of the passage of the *Knights* lies, in my opinion, simply in the sharp differentiation of Crates from the other comic poets, not in the details of the description, which only by hasty and rash interpretation can be made to refer precisely to a non-scurrilous comedy.³

Outside of the *Knights* (and the scholia *ad loc.*, to which I shall refer later) only a scrap or two of external evidence remains, and that, again, is tantalizing. A recently discovered commentary on Aristophanes (*Papiri Greco-Egizii*, ii. 9) contains the words: (πρῶτος δ) ἐὶ δὲ Κράτ(η)ς (ε)ισή(γαγεν), then a gap, and καπηλίδων in the next sentence. This may have ascribed to Crates the introduction of characters like the καπηλίδες, and the general drift may have loosely corresponded to the assertion in an anonymous writer on comedy

¹ The text of the fragment (cf. Kaibel's *Athenaeus* 117c) is unintelligible in part, though the general meaning is clear. Comedy is represented, ironically, as furnishing μέγα βρῶμα at the time of Crates; and the diet supplied by Comedy in his time is illustrated by τάριχος λεφάντινον, the whimsical phrase of Crates.

² The resemblance lies between the lunch in the *Knights* and the μέγα βρῶμα furnished by Comedy according to the ironic statement of the fragment.

³ I admit, of course, that with Aristotle's statement in mind one easily yields to the temptation of pressing the meaning of the passage of the *Knights*, but in view of frag. 333 I think that it is in the interest of conservative interpretation to avoid such large inferences as Neil, *ad loc.*, draws in saying that Crates represents "a foreshadowing of the New comedy" and that "ἀσσειός would especially suit the Athenian Terence."

(Kaibel, 7/30), who says of Crates: *καὶ πρῶτος μεθύοντας ἐν κωμῳδίᾳ παρήγαγεν*. The same fact is reported in Athenaeus (429a), who in a trivial discussion of the use of drunkards in the drama, after contending that Aeschylus, not Euripides, *πρῶτος . . . παρήγαγε τὴν τῶν μεθύοντων ὄψιν εἰς τραγωδίαν*, continues: *ἀγνοοῦσὶ τε οἱ λέγοντες πρῶτον Ἐπίχαρμον ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν παραγαγεῖν μεθύοντα, μεθ' ὃν Κράτητα ἐν Γείτοσι*. Quite apart from the validity of such accounts of *εὐρήματα*, the use of drunkards does not necessarily point to any specific type of comedy, but we may at least observe in Athenaeus the *post hoc* that again binds Epicharmus and Crates; it is not, however, stated as a *propter hoc*.¹

Passing to internal evidence, we find that neither the titles nor the fragments of Crates' and Pherecrates' plays have more than negative value. The statement of Suidas regarding Crates that there were two poets of the name attaches some doubt to the authorship of the titles and fragments referred to him. Clearly, however, neither Aristophanes nor Aristotle was conscious of any ambiguity in referring to Crates. Of the *Thesaurus* and the *Philarguros*, titles which seem to some indicative of a comedy of manners, we have no fragments. Meineke,² judging from the titles, immediately denies the authorship of Crates, and ascribes the plays to the period of Middle or New comedy, a rather singular procedure in view of Aristotle's statement. But only a hasty critic will argue much from such titles. Plays with the title *Thesaurus*, to be sure, were written by half a dozen Hellenistic poets, and Philemon's play of that name was the model of Plautus' *Trinummus*. Certainly *Philarguros* would be a fitting title for a character comedy such as suggested Plautus' *Aulularia*. But Crates' *Thesaurus* may in plot have more nearly resembled Aristophanes' *Plutus* (in this case, perhaps, of some interest as an example of the type of Middle comedy), and we cannot deny that *φιλάργυρος* may mean "grafter" as well as "miser," and that the play was as likely to be a scurrilous satire as a character comedy.³ These possibilities I mention simply to justify my refusal

¹ The evidence clearly does not warrant any suggestion of connection between the drunkards in Crates' plays and the *κῶμος μεθύοντων* of Menander.

² *FCG*, I, 64.

³ The rôle played by *Thesaurus* in Lucian's *Timon* (compared with Antiphanes' *Timon*) strengthens the suggestion that Crates' *Thesaurus* might have resembled the

to argue from titles alone. Of mythological comedy, which is the most completely authenticated material of Epicharmus' plays, Crates has no clear trace save in the title *Dionusos*. Little can safely be argued of the content of the plays from the fragments; the *Theria* presented a picture of Schlaraffenland in which the table set itself, wine poured itself, and the like. This may have been social satire rather than personal abuse; if so, one may well note that such a type of comedy might fall within the range of Aristotle's reference to generalized comedy. Such criticism of social conditions, as distinguished from personal abuse, is more fully suggested by the titles of Pherecrates' plays; frag. 155 proves that this poet was not entirely averse to personal attack, but otherwise the fragments contain no personal criticism. Titles like *Agrioi*, *Metalles*, *Krapataloi*, *Murmekanthropoi*, in combination with fragments and external evidence, point to an interest in Utopian sociological comedy. *Anthropherakles*, *Pseudheracles*, *Cheiron* might have been mythological. Tantalizing possibilities of a comedy of manners are contained in three titles, *Ἐπιλήσμων ἢ Θάλαττα*, *Korianno*, *Petale*; for there is some reason to think that Korianno, and possibly Thalatta and Petale, were names of courtezans.¹

Baffling as the search is for positive confirmation of the facts expressed in Aristotle's statement, I think that we may safely say that his characterization of Crates was part of a larger and consistent theory which found in Sicilian comedy, and in occasional imitations of it in Athens in the fifth century, a substantial foreshadowing of Hellenistic comedy. The scholia on the passage of the *Knights* already discussed are the usual mass of error, idle fancy, and possible fact. One of them, erroneously referring to Crates as a tragic poet,

Plutus in a general way rather than any such play as Philemon wrote. On *φιλάργυρος* in the sense of "grafter" cf. Platonius' account of comedy (Kaibel 3/8), where *φιλάργυροι* is obviously covered by the *χρήματα συλλέγουσιν ἐξ ἀδικίας* of Kaibel 5/49.

¹ The evidence in the case of Thalatta and Petale is hardly valid, that for Korianno is more substantial; cf. Meineke, *FCG*, I, 82, 83, 86 n. 29. The bibulous women, the quarrel of father and son, both perhaps in love with the same courtesan, are suggestive details in the *Korianno*. That Anaxandrides (Suidas s.v.) was the first to introduce into comedy *ἔρωτας καὶ παρθένων φθοράς* is contradicted by what is reported of Aristophanes' *Kokalos* and, in general, statements in which *εὐρήματα* are ascribed to Hellenistic comic poets only substantiate the frequent recurrence in their plays of certain characters and themes. On the *Agrioi* cf. Hoffmann, *Ad antiq. com. historiam symbolae*, Berlin, 1910.

ascribes to him *ὀλιγόστιχα ποιήματα*, and another begins *συμκρὰ ἐποίει*. . . . These references to the smaller compass of Crates' productions may be idle inferences from the "lunch at small expense" in the text of Aristophanes,¹ but a play without a chorus or with a relatively inactive chorus would naturally be appreciably shorter than the normal play of Aristophanes. The concluding sentence, however, of the second scholium is worthy of more serious attention. It will be remembered that Aristophanes in the text distinctly says that Crates endured the anger of the audience and rough knocks at the hands of the spectators, though the younger poet admits that occasional success in the dramatic competition rewarded Crates' efforts. This second scholium is sufficiently at variance with Aristophanes' statement to warrant an inference that the scholiast has information other than that furnished by Aristophanes; the scholium reads: *συμκρὰ ἐποίει καὶ ἔτερπε τοὺς ἀκροατάς, γράφων ἡδέα*. Aristophanes has certainly not emphasized the entertainment furnished the audience by Crates. Now in a familiar passage of Aristotle's *Ethics* (1128a) the philosopher distinguishes buffoonery from true wit:² the buffoon aims only to excite laughter rather than to say what is seemly and to avoid paining the object of his ridicule. Later Aristotle illustrates the difference by an appeal to the Old and the New comedies, meaning by the latter what we call the Middle comedy, and expresses the thought which underlies the ancient theory of comedy found in the late Greek documents summarized above, viz.; that Old comedy found *τὸ γελοῖον* in *αἰσχρολογία*, New (Middle) comedy in *ὑπόνοια*. He then raises the question how we are to define seemly jesting in these words: *πότερον οὖν τὸν εὖ σκώπτοντα ὀριστείον τῷ λέγειν μὴ ἀπρεπῇ ἐλευθερίῳ, ἢ τῷ μὴ λυπεῖν τὸν ἀκούοντα ἢ καὶ τέρπειν; ἢ καὶ τὸ γε τοιοῦτον ἀόριστον; ἄλλο γὰρ ἄλλω μισητόν τε καὶ ἡδύ*. The sharp antithesis between *τὸ λυπεῖν* and *τὸ τέρπειν*, as coterminous with the differentiation between *αἰσχρολογία*

¹ The *Liber Glossarum* (Kaibel, 72/14) ascribes to the earliest writers of Old comedy plays not over 300 verses in length, a statement that is discredited by Kaibel, "Die Prolegomena," 46, n. 1 and exploited by Sieckmann, *op. cit.*, 24, as harmonizing with Birt's conjectural estimate of the length of Epicharmus' plays.

² Cornford, *The Origin of Attic Comedy*, 218 n. 1, briefly notes the relation between the two passages (and Evanthius, quoted above), but Hendrickson, in dealing with Roman satire, had already made full use of the relevant material; cf. *AJP*, XV (1894), 1 ff; XXI (1900), 121 ff; especially XV (1894), 25 and nn. 1, 2.

and *ὑπόνοια*, and between Old and Middle comedy warrants us, I think, in suspecting that the scholiast on the *Knights* in his strange emphasis on *ἔρεπε* and *ἡδέα* is dependent upon just such a differentiation of Old and Middle comedy as Aristotle makes, and by referring to Crates as interested primarily in *τὸ τέρπειν* the scholiast may be echoing part of a fuller discussion of the matter by Aristotle in which not only was Middle comedy differentiated from the Old in the terms of the *Ethics*, but Crates was represented as anticipating the Middle comedy in the terms of the *Poetics*.

This theory seems to emerge in other ancient documents. An anonymous writer on comedy (Kaibel 7/28-8/35) agrees with Aristotle in ascribing non-scurrilous comedy to Crates and adds Pherecrates to the list. In describing Crates he uses the phrase *πάνν γελοῖος καὶ ἱλαρὸς γενόμενος*. The adjective *ἱλαρὸς* is in implied antithesis to *αὐστηρὸς*, *πικρὸς*, and the like, descriptive of the normal poets of Old comedy. This particular antithesis is prominent in the Latin documents, which, we have already remarked, offer a more reasonable statement of Greek theory than the Greek documents, when they come to differentiate the New comedy from the Old. So in the *Liber Glossarum* (Kaibel 72/15) the adjective *ἱλαρὸς* applied to Crates is recalled in the sentence: "postea autem ommissa maledicendi libertate privatorum hominum vitam *cum hilaritate* imitabantur, admonentes quid adpetendum quidve cavendum esset." And *ἡδέα γράφων* applied to Crates by the scholiast on the *Knights* is recalled when we observe the sharp antithesis between the bitter and the sweet of the Old and the New comedy, respectively, in such statements as Diomedes makes (Kaibel 58/165): "secunda aetate fuerunt Aristophanes, Eupolis et Cratinus, qui et principum vitia sectati *acerbissimas* comoedias composuerunt. tertia aetas fuit Menandri, Diphili et Philemonis, qui *omnem acerbitem* comoediae mitigaverunt. . . ." And so Evanthius (Kaibel 64/70) distinguishes New comedy as the type "quae . . . minus amaritudinis spectatoribus et eadem opera *multum delectationis* afferret." Through all such commentary runs the Aristotelian antithesis of *λυπεῖν* and *τέρπειν*, of (*πικρὸς*) and *ἡδύς* as coterminous with the *λοιδορία* and the *ὑπόνοια* of Old and Hellenistic comedy, and the characterization of Crates is an inherent part of this theory.

The theory as theory therefore can be substantially rehabilitated; the value which we attach to it will accord with our estimate of Aristotle's worth as a literary critic. It will, however, still be impossible to confirm either the facts or the theory from the material evidence supplied by our extant remains of Sicilian comedy and of Crates. From this evidence the only conservative inference, if we attach any value to Aristotle's statement, may be best expressed in Wilamowitz' discreet comment:¹ "Um die Entwicklung des Aristophanes und der Komödie überhaupt zu beurteilen, müssten wir eine mythologische Travestie und ein Stück des Pherekrates, wie die *Korianno*, kennen: so ist es bitter, aber unvermeidlich, dass wir resignieren." This passive state of resignation, however, may well become one of positive opposition if modern students of Roman comedy, minimizing this tantalizing evidence of a generalized comedy developing under Sicilian influence in the hands of Crates and Pherecrates in the fifth century, proceed to construct a theory in which Hellenistic comedy appears largely as an issue from Euripidean tragedy.² For weak as the links may be that connect Epicharmus, Crates, and Pherecrates with Hellenistic comedy, they are at

¹ *Sitzb. d. berlin. Akad.* (1911), 485.

² Very reluctantly, in the pages above, I have briefly resumed the evidence of ancient theory, without expecting to add much to the discussion. The proper appreciation, however, of the Euripidean theory seemed to me impossible without once more surveying, I hope conservatively, the opposing view of ancient critics and distinguishing two versions of ancient dogma. The emphasis upon political conditions in one version may be old, as a comparison of Platonius (Kaibel 3/9 ff.) with Ps. Xenoph. *de rep. Ath.* II. 18 suggests; and the aesthetic version does not necessarily exclude the main elements of the political theory. Yet my main interest is not in any precise determination of sources, but in sketching the outlines of an Aristotelian theory in which Old and Middle comedy are sharply differentiated, with proper provision for foreshadowings of the Middle comedy even in the fifth century, and these foreshadowings not primarily in the aggressive triad, Cratinus, Eupolis, and Aristophanes. Very likely, if we had all the material of comedy before us, we might not accept this Aristotelian theory, for modern procedure, in explaining the development of literary types, is more exact than ancient theory; but it is none the less important to note that, with the exception of a single document to be discussed later, ancient theory that is substantially due to Aristotle has found no place for Euripides in accounting for the development of comedy down to at least the middle of the fourth century.

In a brief survey, written simply as preliminary to a discussion of the Euripidean theory, a full bibliography of the treatment by modern scholars of Sicilian-Attic comedy is out of place. A detailed examination of the question may be expected in a Princeton dissertation, as yet unpublished, entitled *The Transition from Old to Middle Comedy*. Older handbooks of Greek literature, as, for example, Bergk-Peppmueller, followed Aristotle's clue, often exaggerating the value of the evidence. Welcker in his study

least sufficient to induce a sober conservative attitude toward any exclusive emphasis upon Euripidean tragedy, or upon a combination of scurrilous comedy and Euripidean tragedy, as the dominant force in the generation of later comedy. The vogue of the modern theory, however, requires a serious consideration of the bases upon which it rests.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[To be concluded]

of Epicharmus in *Kleine Schriften* did not hesitate to emphasize the value of Sicilian-Attic comedy. Hasper devoted a loosely written programme (*De Cratete et Pherecrate nov. com. praecursoribus* [Leipzig, 1877]) to the subject. Zielinski, *Die Gliederung d. altatt. Komödie*, 242, endeavored to discriminate a Dorian, mythological, ethico-social, from an Ionic, political-personal, or elfish, comedy. Süss, in his dissertation *De personarum ant. com. Att. usu atque origine* (Bonn, 1905), saw the significance of Crates and Pherecrates, but in *Rh. Mus.*, LXV (1910), 441 ff. emphasized the value of Aristophanes as foreshadowing Hellenistic comedy. The most recent statements of the case by Körte represent the germs of mythological and realistic comedy as existing in Sicilian comedy; he appreciates the importance of Crates and Pherecrates; nor does he fail to emphasize the influence of Euripides though regarding it as setting in late and gradually increasing; cf. *Hermes*, XXXIX (1904), 486, 490; *Burs.-Jahresb.*, CLII (1911), 233, 244, 258; and his popular essay *Die griech. Komödie* (1914), pp. 24 ff., 68 ff. The effect of Leo's studies in Roman comedy is apparent in most of the recent handbooks of Greek literature, as in Christ-Schmid I², 400, in which the influence of the Sicilian comedy of types on Old comedy, particularly on Crates, and then upon Middle and New comedy, it is remarked, "kann zuversichtlich angenommen werden," and "the same influence is probably effective upon the Atellan play"; the force of "zuversichtlich" can be estimated by the full statement of Euripidean influence in the same handbook, II/1⁴, 26 ff.

LAND RECLAMATION IN THE FAYUM UNDER PTOLEMIES PHILADELPHUS AND EUERGETES I

By W. L. WESTERMANN

CHRONOLOGY

The ancient irrigation system of the Nile Valley which Ptolemy Soter found in operation when he took control of Egypt had been developed by a gradual process of evolution which had already covered a period of more than three thousand years before Alexander entered the country. No data remain to us from the Pharaonic period which can give us an insight into the details of canal and embankment construction. Fortune has been kinder to us in the Ptolemaic period. In 1889-90 Mr. Flinders Petrie made an important discovery of paper coffins at Tell-Gurob, a mound lying south and west of the Bahr-Yusuf (Canal of Joseph) in the angle where it turns sharply northwestward to enter the Fayum. These coffins were found to be manufactured of old papyri glued together. The difficulty encountered in detaching the separate papyri explains the shattered condition of this group of documents, which was published as the famous *Petrie Papyri*.¹ For our present purpose the important documents are a series of letters from the official correspondence of Cleon and his successor Theodorus, engineers in charge of state building projects, including irrigation, in the Fayum.² The private letters which passed between Cleon and various members of his family are among the most appealing documents which have come down to us from antiquity.³ No one endowed with an imagination and a kindly heart could read the intimate letters of this family

¹ *Flinders Petrie Papyri*. Vols. I and II edited by J. P. Mahaffy; Vol. III, by J. P. Mahaffy and J. G. Smyly. Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs VIII (1891), IX (1893), XI (1905). Dublin.

² P. Pet. II, III.

³ The private letters will be found in best form in S. Witkowski, *Epistulae Privatae Graecae*, 2d ed. (Leipzig, 1911). The career of Cleon has been sketched sympathetically by Wilamowitz, *Reden und Vorträge* (Berlin, 1902), pp. 246-53. A. Bouché-Leclercq has reconstructed the whole career of Cleon in an attractive article, "L'Ingénieur Cleon," *Revue des études grecques*, XXI (1908), 121-52.

without a feeling of deep sympathy for Cleon in the hour of his disgrace and retirement from his high position. Unfortunately the private letters do not concern us here, excepting as we may trace in them the outlines of the public career of Cleon.

The official activity of Cleon as engineer (*ἀρχιτέκτων*) in the Arsinoite Nome (the Fayum) may be traced, in the correspondence saved to us, from the twenty-seventh year to the thirty-third year of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 258–252 B.C.¹

The date of the appointment of Theodorus as successor to Cleon is uncertain, although we have an official announcement (date lost) addressed to the oeconomi, nomarchs, royal scribes of the nomes, police officials, comarchs, and village scribes, of the advancement of Theodorus (P. Pet. II, 42 (a), p. 138) from the position of sub-engineer (*ὑπαρχιτέκτων*) to that of full guardianship of the dykes and the control of the irrigation waters. In the year 30 of Philadelphus, 255 B.C., Petechonsis was *ὑπαρχιτέκτων*. Presumably, then, Theodorus came into that position *after* the year 255. He appears for the first time as *architecton* in the year 2 of Euergetes, 245 B.C.,² is holding that office in the years 241 and 240 B.C.,³ and appears for the last time as *architecton*, so far as the papyri show, in the year 10, or 237 B.C.⁴ The extant papyri falling later than 237 B.C. do not mention the *ἀρχιτέκτων* or the *ὑπαρχιτέκτων*. This may, of course, be chance, and the office may have continued for a long time. But the probabilities are that it ceased to exist thereafter, because the work was completed.⁵ The official activity of Cleon and Theodorus was

¹ The memorial addressed by Cleon to Diotimus, P. Pet. II, 13, (17), p. 42, mentions official activities of the year 27 of Philadelphus. I agree with Wilamowitz, *Reden und Vorträge*, p. 249, note 3, as against Wilcken, in identifying this Cleon with the engineer of the entire correspondence. P. Pet. II, 13, (11), p. 39, is of the twenty-eighth year. In P. Pet. III, 42, F a, the date must be restored [X]γ, the thirty-third year, and in it Cleon still has the official title *ἀρχιτέκτων*. In the unsettled condition of the dating of regnal years in the third century B.C. I am arbitrarily accepting the later date of the two possibilities offered by Grenfell and Hunt in their table in P. Hib. Appendix III.

² P. Pet. III, 43, (2), p. 119.

³ P. Pet. II, 9, (2), (3), (4), pp. 22, 23, and 24.

⁴ P. Pet. II, 15, (2), p. 52. For the date, *εἰς τὸ α*, see P. Pet. III, 42, (7), p. 131. As a result of the dating *εἰς τὸ α* the dioecetes Eutyches in H. Maspero's list, in *Les Finances d'Égypte sous les Lagides*, p. 245, is to be definitely placed in the year 10 of Ptolemy III, or 237 B.C.

⁵ Ulrich Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, I, 1, p. 332.

apparently confined to the Fayum. We have, as yet, no information about any *architecton* attached to any other nome than the Arsinoite, nor have we any knowledge of any other original reclamation project from any other nome or period, on any similar scale.¹

The results of the reclamation work accomplished under Cleon and Theodorus are still discernible to the eyes of the archaeologists who have worked in the Fayum.² For no remains or articles have been found on the third, or next to the lowest, plateau of the Fayum and none on the lower half of the second plateau, which antedate the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. In other words, these portions of the Fayum had no villages upon them before Philadelphus' time, but were still under water. Geographic and archaeological evidence, therefore, prove that these plateaus were laid bare in the third century B.C. The *Petrie Papyri* have given us the names of the two engineers who directed the important project, with some details as to the methods of work employed in carrying it out.

Table I may help to visualize our present knowledge of the chronology of the work as shown in the names of the officials in charge as engineers and sub-engineers. Wherever the official title appears along with the name in the correspondence of any year, that fact is indicated in the table.

TABLE I

Year	Engineer	Sub-Engineer
B.C.		
258	Cleon	
257	Cleon	
256	Cleon	
255	Cleon, title ἀρχιτέκτων given	Petechnosis, title ὑπαρχιτέκτων given
254	Cleon	
253	Cleon	
252	Cleon, title ἀρχιτέκτων given	
251 } date in- 247 } definite }	Theodorus	Theodorus, title ὑπαρχιτέκτων given
245	Theodorus, title ἀρχιτέκτων given	
241	Theodorus	
240	Theodorus, title ἀρχιτέκτων given	
239	Theodorus*	
237	Theodorus, title ἀρχιτέκτων given	

* In this year Theodorus combined in his person the office of ἀρχιτέκτων and οἰκονόμος.
—P. Pet. II, 9, (5), p. 24.

¹ The project described in P. Lille, 1, is for the recovery of waste lands formerly under cultivation, but now unproductive.

² Grenfell, Hunt, Hogarth, *Fayum Towns and Their Papyri* (P. Fay.) (London, 1900), pp. 2, 14, 15.

The work of reclamation in the Fayum certainly, therefore, extended over a period of twenty-one years, 258–237 B.C. Witkowski¹ seems to put the beginning of the task about 260 B.C. Bouché-Leclercq ascribes the whole reclamation scheme to Ptolemy Soter and indicates a much earlier date in the reign of Philadelphus² for the actual beginning of operations. I have little hesitation in agreeing with the latter and find several reasons for suggesting 270 B.C. as the latest date which can be considered. In the year 255 B.C. a "Canal of Cleon," named after the engineer, is nearing completion.³ One must presuppose that several seasons' work had already been done upon this canal, which is a new one, and that the activities of Cleon had been so important in connection with it as to attract his sovereign's attention to the extent of naming the canal in honor of the chief engineer. This would carry the engineering work of Cleon earlier than 260 B.C. Secondly, P. Pet. II, 16, is undoubtedly a letter out of the correspondence of Cleon's family.⁴ It mentions events which occurred in the years 265 and 264 and was evidently written in the period 263–260 B.C. Even that early Cleon is already close to the king. A more convincing consideration is this. The correspondence of the year 28, or 257 B.C.,⁵ shows that a certain village in the reclaimed area, named Philoteris, had long since been established, and the land around it brought under cultivation. For even in that year the dykes are distinguished as "new" and "old" dykes. Throughout the Cleon correspondence it is evident that the canals in the reclaimed area were already being used for purposes of irrigation in the years 258–252 B.C. As soon as the size of the lake had been diminished, the reclaimed land was settled with agricultural colonists and brought under cultivation as rapidly as the canals could be extended. As a result of this occupation and use, the further extension of canals and dykes must have progressed slowly. New construction and repairs were carried on usually during

¹ "Circa a. 260 magnam Moeridis lacus partem siccavit"—Witkowski, *Epist. Privatae Graecae*, 2d ed., p. 1.

² In *Revue des Etudes grecques*, XXI, 122; cf. P. Fay., p. 15.

³ P. Pet. II, 6, p. 17: καὶ συντελέσαι τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς Κλέωνος διώρυγος.

⁴ Witkowski, *loc. cit.*, No. 4.

⁵ P. Pet. III, 37. This village has been identified by Grenfell and Hunt, P. Fay., p. 63, and located at the site of the modern village of Wadfa (see map at end of P. Fay.).

the months Epiph to Athyr, or July to November inclusive. For this was the flood period, and the labor of the farms would then be available for other than agricultural work. Furthermore, as several of the extant contracts for construction work clearly show, work upon dykes and canals in the remaining months of the year tended to impede the regular process of irrigating the land.¹ These are the reasons which make it seem reasonable to stretch the period of this reclamation work backward from 237 to 270 B.C., or perhaps earlier. The work could not have been completed under Philadelphus, nor could it have been carried out speedily, as Grenfell assumed.²

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

¹ P. Pet. II, 9, (4), p. 24: *συντελεσθήτω τὸ ἔργον ἵνα μὴ ὕστερον ἐπὶ τοῦ ποτισμοῦ πράγματα ἡμῖν παρέχῃ.* Cf. P. Pet. III, 43, Col. II, p. 119, a contract for construction work with the stipulation *οὐθὲν ἐπικωλύοντες βρέχειν τὴν γῆν.*

² P. Fay., p. 15.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

PROFESSOR REID ON CICERO

ATT. xiii. 33. 1 and *FAM.* xvi. 23. 1

The two passages are as follows:

Att. xiii. 33. 1 (dated June 3, 45): "O negligentiam miram! Semelne putas mihi dixisse Balbum et Faberium professionem relatam? Qui etiam eorum iussu miserim qui profiteretur; ita enim oportere dicebant. Professus est Philotimus libertus. Nosti credo librarium. Sed scribes et quidem confectum."

Fam. xvi. 23. 1 (dated May 27, 44): "Tu vero confice professionem, si potes; etsi haec pecunia ex eo genere est ut professione non egeat. Verum tamen!"

It is seldom that so much depends on interpretation. If the view I have taken is correct,¹ that the *professiones* mentioned here are annual returns of property and are to be identified with the returns provided for in the *lex Iulia municipalis*,² we are well on the road to proving that Caesar introduced into Rome (and into the rest of Italy) the yearly property registration in vogue in Egypt, and, in fact, reorganized the Roman census. Professor Reid³ thinks that my view is mistaken. He admits that the passages have the same context and relate to some legislation of Caesar, but maintains there are at least two more probable explanations. In the first he supposes a reference to the *lex Iulia sumptuaria*, which placed a tax on tombs equal to the amount of expense incurred above the legally permitted limit. As Cicero at this time was intent on a monument to his daughter, the *professiones* are best understood as declarations before an official respecting its cost. In fact, in the words, "haec pecunia ex eo genere est ut professione non egeat," we have "the precise amount to be expended in excess of that fixed by the law." This hypothesis leaves several things unaccounted for, among them: (1) how this "precise amount" was arrived at when Cicero was uncertain what the expense would be, (2) the difficulty (implied in

¹ The discussion has arisen from my article, "The Professiones of the Heracleian Tablet," in the *Journal of Roman Studies*, V, 125-37. A fuller statement of certain points may be found in the writer's "Ciceronian and Heracleian Professiones," *Classical Quarterly*, October, 1917.

² The text is conveniently consulted in Bruns' *Fontes* (7th ed.), pp. 102-3. I assume for the moment its Caesarian authorship. If my contention is right, both this and the date are established beyond question.

³ "The So-called Lex Iulia Municipalis," *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, V, 207 ff.

the letter to Tiro) of filling out the return, (3) the requirement of two returns just a year apart, (4) the fact that the reports were made before any expense had been incurred. But, aside from this, the hypothesis is disproved by the certainty that the monument was not a tomb, but a shrine, and as such exempt from the sumptuary law. (Even Caesar would hardly put a tax on temples!) It is true that from Tullia's death in February¹ till the following May, Cicero contemplated a tomb, which he then changed to a shrine. One reason for the change (which was coincident with his finding out about the law)² was to escape the legal penalty, the other the better to secure his daughter's apotheosis. The evidence for this is Cicero's own statement. "I am determined," he says,³ "to build a shrine and to avoid all likeness to a tomb, not so much on account of the penalty of the law as most effectively to accomplish *apothéosis*." Professor Reid seeks to avoid this fatal objection by supposing that Cicero was mistaken about the law. Instead of being guided by the evidence in the case, Professor Reid would explain it away.

Professor Reid's alternative solution is to relate the passages to Cicero's supposed procedure under the debtors' act⁴ to bring about a settlement of his claim against Faberius, to whom he had lent a sum of money some months previous. Being in need of money for the shrine, he placed on public file a statement of the debt—the *professio* of June 3. This statement (by chance) came into the hands of Faberius, himself a public *scriba*, who, seeing that it was his own debt, neglected to enter it on the records. He also deceived Balbus, whose statement that it had been recorded is thus accounted for. A year later⁵ Cicero, finding that his claim did not come within the law (his second legal blunder, by the way), wrote to Tiro⁶ that "this particular sum did not require registration." And yet in the same breath he assents to the registration. But this is not more strange than that Cicero in the original declaration should look for guidance in the procedure to his debtor. He was not, in fact, unacquainted with the provisions of the law. As early as July 46, in a letter to Paetus,⁷ he makes them the basis of some elaborate irony, and on March 17, 45, he writes to Atticus⁸ of settling his debt to Ovia by a transfer of land under the same act.

It is an assumption (a very necessary one, indeed) of this hypothesis that Faberius was a *scriba* in the sense that he copied public records or had charge of such work. As we know, he was Caesar's secretary⁹ and had but recently returned from this service in Spain¹⁰ to assist Balbus in directing

¹ Schmidt, *Briefwechsel*, p. 271.

⁶ *Fam.* xvi. 23. 1.

² *Att.* xii. 35. 2.

⁷ *Fam.* ix. 18. 4.

³ *Att.* xii. 36. 1.

⁸ *Att.* xii. 21. 3.

⁴ Carried by Caesar in 49.

⁹ Appian, *B.C.* iii. 1. 5.

⁵ May 27, 44.

¹⁰ *Cic. Att.* xviii. 28. 1; Schmidt, "Faberius," in *Commentationes Fleckeisenianae*, p. 229.

affairs in Italy. He had a splendid house on the Aventine.¹ That such a man should occupy himself with clerical labor is almost ludicrous. It is true Vitruvius speaks of him as "Faberius scriba,"² but Professor Reid overlooks the fact (as some lexicographers have done) that the word is also used of the secretary to a high official. Cicero refers to his own secretary during his governorship of Cilicia as *scriba meus* and to C. Septimius (who was charged by Vettius with having brought him a dagger from the consul Bibulus) as *scribam Bibuli*.³ This was undoubtedly the title of Caesar's secretary, so that there need be no further difficulty in identifying Vitruvius' *scriba* with Appian's ὁ γραμματεὺς.

A second assumption of Professor Reid's interpretation is that Faberius' debt was still unsettled on May 27, 44. Cicero does not state definitely when the settlement took place. It was probably, as Schmidt has shown,⁴ in the week following May 30, 45. At all events the debt is not mentioned further, which is sufficient evidence that it did not drag on for a year longer, especially as Cicero continued to cherish his plan for the shrine,⁵ and to be in need of money for this purpose.

Notwithstanding his interest in Faberius, Professor Reid has apparently overlooked Cicero's letter of May 30.⁶ Atticus had arranged a tentative settlement with Faberius which, however, was unsatisfactory in some particulars. He then referred the matter to Cicero, who on May 30 wrote to express his approval of the arrangement, though the details were still to be settled. Four days later, on June 3 (on Professor Reid's theory), Cicero announces to Atticus that with the co-operation of Faberius and Balbus he had taken recourse to the law, implying that he had been so engaged for several days and that Atticus had thought him remiss. In the face of such contradiction and absurdity the collapse of the whole hypothesis is inevitable.

As both of Professor Reid's interpretations seem untenable, I may indicate summarily the grounds of my own position. The intervention of Balbus and Faberius in *Att.* xiii. 33. 1 makes it certain that some recently passed law of Caesar's is in question. If we examine the *professiones* which Cicero was required to make out and file, we find they had the following external features: they were presented at Rome; they must be handed in by a fixed date (hence the anxiety of Atticus and of Cicero himself); they could be (and in this case were) made by proxy (by Philotimus in the first instance and by Tiro in the second); they were entered in the public records; they were periodical, that is to say, annual (the two returns being made just a year apart and under almost precisely similar circumstances). The

¹ Vitruvius, vii. 9. 2.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Fam.* v. 20. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; *Att.* ii. 24. 2. Cf. *Verr.* i. 157; ii. 170; iii. 181.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 236; *Briefwechsel*, p. 297.

⁵ Cf. *Att.* xv. 15. 3 (dated June 5, 44).

⁶ *Att.* xiii. 3.

subject-matter of the *professiones* was property. This is revealed in Cicero's statement to Tiro: "*haec pecunia ex eo genere est ut professione non egeat*," in which *pecunia* is the regular word for property, especially in its relation to the census.¹ What, now, was the purpose of the returns? Being made annually and relating to property, they were evidently required by the government for the sake of the information they contained. In other words, they were census returns to be used as the basis of administration. The significance of this is that similar *professiones* are provided for in Caesar's Municipal Law. If, then, Cicero is referring in the two letters to some legislation of Caesar, it must be to this. Unless we are willing (as some critics seem to be) to substitute mere possibilities for known and admitted facts, no other conclusion is possible. With this connection firmly established, it is possible to proceed to some interesting and valuable conclusions, among them, the hitherto unrecognized fact that Caesar completely reorganized the Roman census.

JEFFERSON ELMORE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

HORACE, *SERMONES* ii. 1. 34-39

Sequor hunc, Lucanus an Apulus anceps,
nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus,
missus ad hoc, pulsus, vetus est ut fama, Sabellis,
quo ne per vacuum Romano incurreret hostis,
sive quod Apula gens seu quod Lucania bellum
incuteret violenta.

The general sense of this passage is clear enough; the particular purpose Horace had in mind in writing this apparent digression (note the resumptive *sed* in 39) has been admirably stated by Wickham. But editors have long felt difficulty over one detail, *quo ne* (37). It will suffice to cite the unsatisfactory notes of two of the most recent editors of the *Sermones*. In 1909 Professor Morris wrote on *quo ne* only the following words: "for *ut ne* or *ut eo ne*; but this use of *quo* is without a parallel." In 1910 Heinze, in Kiessling, *Q. Horatius Flaccus Satiren*⁴, printed this note: "*quo ne* singular für *ut eo ne*, idem *eo* im Sinne *ea re* das vorausgegangene *missus ad hoc* wieder aufnimmt: 'damit auf diese Weise nicht. . . .'"

For a very much better discussion of the passage we may turn to the note in Arthur Palmer's edition of the *Satires*. Professor Palmer also suggested a perfectly simple explanation of the passage, though he did not, in my judgment, make as good a defense of his suggestion as it is easily possible

¹ Cf. Cic. *Leg.* iii. 3. 7; Livy xxix. 37. 7; *Lex Iulia municipalis* v. 147; Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, p. 222.

to make. He regarded *quo* as the relative pronoun, with its antecedent in *Venusinus . . . colonus* (35), and he construed it as ablative of separation with *vacuum*, though he translated rather carelessly by "through a space unguarded by him." I have never been able to see why so simple an explanation has been persistently neglected, and why in its stead competent scholars have preferred to foist upon Horace a combination which they admit to be without a parallel. If one looks at the passage carefully, he sees that in 37, even if he accepts the view of Heinze and Morris, he must supply with *vacuum*, as its necessary complement, some word in the ablative suggesting persons and equivalent logically to *defensoribus*. Since this is inevitable, why not find that complement in *quo*, and thus at the same time find an easy explanation of that word, in logic and in syntax both? For all this one finds a perfect parallel in Horace himself:

si cui praeterea validus male filius in re
 praeclara sublatus aletur, ne manifestum
 caelibis obsequium nudet te, leniter in spem
 adrepe officiosus, ut et scribare secundus
 heres, et, si quis casus puerum egerit Orco,
 in vacuum venias. . . . [Serm. ii. 5. 45-50]

How can one interpret at all here unless he supplies *eo*=*filio* with *vacuum*? If he does that, he has a perfect parallel to Serm. ii. l. 37, *quo ne*, as interpreted above.

This parallel Professor Palmer did not cite. He referred only to Ovid *Met.* 7. 653, *vacuos cultoribus agros*. But there are many parallels, in fact, for *vacuus* construed with an ablative word dependent on it which suggests a person or persons. Compare e.g., Caesar, *B.G.* vii. 45. 7: "Vacua castra hostium Caesar conspicatus" (the departure of the enemy had been stated in 5); *Aen.* vi. 269: "perque domos Ditis vacuas et inania regna"; *Aen.* ii. 528 and vii. 379: *vacua atria*; *Aen.* ii. 761: *porticibus vacuis*; Juvenal iii. 2-3: "laudo tamen, vacuis quod sedem figere Cumis destinet atque unum civem donare Sibyllae"; Horace *Epp.* i. 7. 45: *vacuum Tibur*, and i. 7. 49-51: "conspexit . . . adrasum quendam vacua tonsoris in umbra cultello proprios purgantem leniter unguis" (see Morris's notes *ad loc.*). In all these passages and in others it is the absence of human beings that *vacuus* connotes.

Finally, to make entirely clear the interpretation supported above, I add a rendering of ii. l. 38-39: "sent out, after the expulsion of the Sabines, so story says, for this very purpose, that the foe might not make raids on the Romans across land empty of him." An affirmative rendering would be at once less awkward and clearer: "that he might fill up the land and so keep the foe from making raids across it on the Romans."

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NOTE ON PLATO *REPUBLIC* 368A

The playful address ὦ παῖδες ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρός has been the subject of many discussions which are summed up in Adam's article in *Classical Review*, X, 237 and in his note *ad loc.* Following Stallbaum and others he takes "that man" to be Thrasymachus, whose doctrine Glaucon and Adeimantus are restating. So in *Philebus* 36D Protarchus is facetiously saluted ὦ παῖ 'κείνου τάνδρός because he has inherited or taken over the argument of Philebus, or as Bury suggests because he was a disciple of Gorgias. But whatever the jocose application in the *Philebus*, Badham is right in saying that "the word ἐκείνος is often substituted for the proper name in speaking of an absent, or deceased person with respect." The entire context in the *Republic* shows that this honorific suggestion predominates here. Adam's fancy that 'Αρίστωνος in the verses is a pun on ἀριστος, that is, "his excellency" Thrasymachus, is wholly out of keeping with the tone and feeling of the passage that celebrates the prowess of Plato's family in war.

A parallel, not, to my knowledge, hitherto cited in this connection, may explain Plato's predilection for the phrase. In Iamblichus *Vit. Pythag.* 88 we read εἶναι δὲ πάντα ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀνδρός· προσαγορεύουσι γὰρ οὕτω τὸν Πυθαγόραν καὶ οὐ καλοῦσιν ὀνόματι, and again in 255 ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῷ μηδὲνα τῶν Πυθαγορείων ὀνομάζειν Πυθαγόραν, ἀλλὰ ζῶντα μὲν, ὅποτε βούλονται δηλῶσαι, καλεῖν αὐτὸν θείον, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐτελεύτησεν, ἐκείνον τὸν ἄνδρα, καθάπερ Ὅμηρος ἀποφαίνει τὸν Εὐμαιον ἱπὲρ Ὀδυσσεύς μεμνημένον,

τὸν μὲν ἐγών, ὦ ξεῖνε, καὶ οὐ παρεόντ' ὀνομάζειν || αἰδέομαι· πέρι γάρ μ' ἐφίλει καὶ ἐκῆδeto λίην·

If this represents a genuine Pythagorean tradition Plato's playful adoption of the expression is explained. In ἐκείνον τὸν Θαλῆν (Aristophanes *Clouds* 186) the more colloquial term differs by the retention of the proper name. How natural the phrasing is in Greek appears from the tone of Pindar's κείνος ἀνὴρ O. 6. 7, where the application is of course different but the honorific substitution for the proper name is analogous. λοιπὸν περὶ τοῦ Ἀγῆσιου φησὶν the painfully explicit scholiast comments.

PAUL SHOREY

GREEK PARALLELS FOR *OPUS EST*

In his discussion of *opus est* and *usus est* with the ablative Bennett in his *Syntax of Early Latin*, Vol. II, "The Cases," pp. 356 ff., properly rejects the theory of Reifferscheid¹ that in this expression *usus* is a genitive. In his treatment of *opus est*, however, Bennett accepts the fantastic hypothesis of Reifferscheid that *opus* is a genitive meaning "of service." As the strongest

¹ *Index Lectionum*, Breslau, Wintersemester, 1877.

evidence in favor of such a view he cites Cato (*Frg.* p. 79, 7 [Jord.]): "Emas non quod opus est, sed quod necesse est; quod non opus est, asse carum est (cf. Cic. *de Off.* iii. 32, 115, and Livy, xliii. 19. 4). If the theory of the genitive origin of *opus est* be true, is it not strange that in the foregoing quoted sentence Cato balances *opus est*, not by *necessus est* or *necessis est*, forms that are sometimes defended as containing a word of genitive origin, but by *necesse est*, for which a genitive origin is never claimed?

The origin of the construction *usus est* with the ablative offers no real difficulties. The use of the ablative with *usus est* may owe its origin to the use of the ablative with *utor*. The development of a special meaning for *usus est* may have caused the Roman mind at an early date to analyze the ablative with *usus est* (ablatival) as being of a different nature from that used with *utor*, which was clearly instrumental. For instance, in Greek we have *χράσμαι* governing the instrumental dative; but in the expressions *οὐ πόνων κεχρήμεθα* (Eur. *Med.* 334) and *ἰν' οὐ χρεὼ πείσματός ἐστιν* (Hom. *Od.* ix. 136, cf. Plato *Legg.* 834b) we find a genitive that has an ablative flavor. This distinction should be borne in mind as we pass to the consideration of *opus est*.

That *usus est* may have exerted considerable influence in helping the development of *opus est* is not unlikely, but it can be shown from certain Greek parallels that such a development in the meaning of *opus est* was easily possible unassisted, by itself. In opposing the position of Schoell,¹ who holds that the development of the ablative with *opus est* was due to analogy with *usus est*, Bennett says: "The weak point in Schoell's argument is his failure to explain how *opus est* (*opus* meaning 'work') could have acquired a meaning sufficiently similar to that of *usus est* to give opportunity for any such analogical process. Both Hoffmann and Schoell feel compelled to apologize for their difficulty in finding any adequate rendering for *opus est aliqua re* which shall explain how its force developed." True, Schoell did not cite any such parallel; for he (like Bennett himself, I fear) overlooked the significance of the Greek parallels cited by Hoffmann, *Studien auf dem Gebiet der lat. Syntax* (1884), where (p. 126 n. 3) he cites the Greek parallels Herod. i. 79, *εὗρισκε πρῆγμα οἱ εἶναι ἐλαύνειν ὡς δύναιτο τάχιστα ἐπὶ τὰς Σάρδεις* (cf. *ibid.* i. 207; iv. 11; vii. 12); also Herod. i. 17, *ὡς τε ἐπείδρης μὴ εἶναι ἔργον τῇ στρατιῇ*. Hoffmann may not have chosen the most felicitous examples for proving the case, but his examples are sufficient to show that one's work (*opus*, *ἔργον*, *πρᾶγμα*) may be regarded as one's duty, obligation, need, "mussarbeit."² This *opus*, *ἔργον*, etc., may be defined by an infinitive clause, as in Herod. i. 79, cited above; or, a genitive (in Latin the ablative, though probably under Greek influence the genitive occurs in Livy, Propertius, Quintilian, and Apuleius) may be used to specify the instrument or the

¹ *ALL.*, II, 207 ff.

² See Walde² and Meringer in *IF.*, XVII, 127; XVIII, 208 f.

quality needed wherewith to carry out the work. The transition between the two meanings may well be seen in the two following examples:

τί δῆτα τόξων ἔργον, εἰ δίκην ἔχεις;

[Eur. *Alc.* 39.]

"What then, is the work of arrows. . . . What need is there, then, of arrows. . . . " In Plato *Resp.* 537d: καὶ ἐνταῦθα δὴ πολλῆς φυλακῆς ἔργον, ὦ ἑταῖρε, "And therein verily there is need of great precaution, my friend." In the latter passage the translation "work" would no longer do justice to the meaning. Other instances of the genitive with ἔργον are Eur. *Hipp.* 911; *Androm.* 551; *Soph. El.* 1373; *Her.* i. 17 (see above); *Arist. Pax*, 1310; *Plut.* 1158; *Plutarch, Popl.* 13; (with πρᾶγμα) *Plutarch, Pomp.* 65.

ANDREW R. ANDERSON

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

BOOK REVIEWS

Essays and Studies Presented to William Ridgeway on His Sixtieth Birthday. Edited by E. C. QUIGGIN. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Pp. xxv+656. 25s.

Like other books of its kind, this large volume of essays bids defiance to the reviewer whose space is limited. The unusual breadth of Professor Ridgeway's interests is strikingly shown, in humorous vein, by Mr. Godley's admirable heroic couplets, which open the volume, and in earnest by the variety of subjects treated by the contributors to the work—colleagues, friends, and pupils of the distinguished scholar. The studies are arranged in three groups, twenty-five papers dealing with the classics and ancient archaeology, seven treating of mediaeval literature and history (including two Irish texts), and fifteen on anthropology and comparative religion. The interest of the Greek scholar will not be confined to the first division, for the second contains Mr. Wace's account of "A Byzantine Inscription from Okridha," and the third, Dr. Rendel Harris' "The Dioscuri in Byzantium and the Neighborhood"; but there is room here only for brief notices—enough, it is hoped, to guide the classical reader—of the papers in the first group.

The first paper, Professor R. S. Conway's penetrating study of the structure of *Aeneid* vi, is a valuable supplement to Norden's commentary. In the second, "A New Clue to the Order of the Platonic Dialogues," Mr. J. I. Beare supposes "that Plato's dialogues contain marks of the steps by which their author gradually withdrew from the fallaciously simple Socratic doctrine (i.e., that ἀρετή = ἐπιστήμη), and made his way nearer and nearer to the conclusions which, taking full account of feeling, are found in the *Republic* and the *Laws*." Upon this theory he arranges the dialogues (pp. 36-39), and in the remainder of the essay explains his reasons for the positions assigned. L. C. Purser follows with "Notes on Cicero ad Atticum xi," in which he discusses some twenty difficult passages. Father Browne's "Aristotle's Theory of Poetic Metre" involves a discussion of the meaning of ἡ τοῖς μέτροις in the vexed passage at the beginning of the *Poetics* (1447 a 29). He renders the words "metrical language of course," denying the disjunctive force to ἡ here; but at the end of the paper he suggests three different methods of handling the phrase.

In his paper "ΔΙΑ ΛΙΘΟΝ and Iovem Lapidem," Mr. E. Harrison questions the usual reading of Polybius iii. 25. 6, and holds that διὰ λίθου or διὰ λίθων or διὰ λίθων was the author's meaning; but in view of certain Latin evidence he does not venture to assert that Jupiter the Stone is "a god begotten by a stone on a preposition" (p. 98). A. S. F. Gow ("Elpis and Pandora in Hesiod's *Works and Days*") discusses the difficult ll. 90-104 and shows reasons for doubting Pandora's original connection with the jar-story. A. W. Gomme ("The Ancient Name of Gla") adds Phlegya and Gyrton to the list of possibilities. Mr. J. T. Sheppard ("The Partheneion of Alkman") offers a new version and suggests an ingenious interpretation of ll. 36-101.

Two companion studies in Greek religion are presented by Miss Harrison and Mr. F. M. Cornford. The first is styled "Sophocles' *Ichneutae*, Col. ix. 1-7, and the δρώμενον of Kyllene and the Satyrs." The author notes a connection between the lines cited and a class of vases representing the Anodos of an earth-goddess attended by leaping satyrs. Kyllene she holds to be a local earth-goddess, the mound shown on the vase (within which the goddess rises) is originally a bee-hive treasury, and the δρώμενον—readers of Miss Harrison will anticipate the conclusion!—is the summoning of a year-god. Fortunately Miss Harrison does not ask us to believe that Sophocles was conscious of these inner meanings. Mr. Cornford ("The ἀπαρχαί and the Eleusinian Mysteries"), following a suggestion of Warde Fowler about the Roman *mundus*, holds that the ἀπαρχαί of grain sent to Eleusis were not merely thank-offerings, but seed corn stored up in underground granaries (σιροί) for use in the next sowing. The mythical descent and return of Kore (the corn-maiden) refer to the depositing of seed grain in the house or treasury of Pluto and its later removal, not to the sowing and sprouting of grain in the earth.

I have abandoned the order of the book to group together here the papers of interest to the archaeologist, which occur for the most part toward the middle of this division. G. F. Hill ("Was It the Mint of Smyrna?") describes sixteen bronze coins and eight blanks of copper found near Smyrna, and infers from the circumstances of the find that the place must have been the mint of Smyrna itself or of some neighboring small town. Mr. R. M. Dawkins describes "A Re-cut Gem from Melos," (p. 167), a prehistoric steatite, originally with some animal design, but later fashioned into a Christian amulet. P. N. Ure presents "An Early Black Figure Vase from Rhitsona in Boeotia" (p. 178). Mr. E. M. W. Tillyard republishes and gives the first satisfactory illustration (p. 186) of "An Attic Lekythos from Sicily," with a quaint and interesting group of gods as fishermen—Poseidon, Hermes, and Heracles. Mr. Flinders Petrie ("Some Royal Signets") describes, among others, a bronze official ring of Ptolemy IV and a gold ring with the cartouche of Antoninus Pius (p. 193). O. L. Richmond, writing on "The Temples of

Divus Augustus and Apollo Palatinus upon Roman Coins," contends that the temple of the latter, not the former, is shown on a certain bronze coin of Caligula (Cohen 9-11), and proposes a new theory as to the site of the *Templum Novum Divi Augusti* (sketch map, p. 212). Mr. R. C. Bosanquet ("Some Axes and a Spear," p. 269) points out that a certain bronze ax found near Patras has an exact counterpart in one found in Campania, and calls attention to the evidence it furnishes of early intercourse between Greece and Italy. An iron spear-butt (*σπυρτήρ*) said to be from the same neighborhood, he shows to be similar to certain bronze pieces found at Olympia and previously wrongly called spear-heads.

Returning to the philological papers: D. S. Robertson ("The Authenticity and Date of Lucian *De Saltatione*") upholds the genuineness of the piece and assigns it to 162-65 A.D. Professor Mahaffy ("The Arithmetical Figures Used by Greek Writers during the Classical Period") groups together a few passages in Herodotus (i. 72) and Thucydides (iii. 50, 68; iv. 116), where he holds that errors have arisen from misreading of "literary symbols" for numbers; these, rather than the lapidary figures, he believes to have been used by writers of the classical period. Mr. A. B. Cook ("Nephelokokygia") suggests that the close of the *Birds*, with its parody on the *hieros gamos* of Zeus and Hera, may have special reference to the Argive version of the story, connected with Mount Kokkygion, where Zeus, in cuckoo form, was united to Hera. W. M. L. Hutchinson ("Two Notes on Nemean iii") interprets the "Asopian Water" of ll. 3-4 as referring to the bay between Salamis and Aegina, and reads *ἄγρην* for *ἀγοράν*, l. 14. W. H. Duke contributes a new edition and a valuable discussion of "The Fragments of Heraclides the Critic" (on the cities of Greece).

Less directly related to the interests of Greek and Latin scholars are "Notes on Iranian Ethnography," by J. H. Moulton, whose recent death is deplored by all students of ancient religion and history: "A Bactrian Winged Lion," by Sir Hercules Read; and "An Early Dynastic Vase in the Fitzwilliam Museum," by F. W. Green.

The American reader will be interested in the late R. Y. Tyrrell's clever version in Eupolideans of a passage in the *Biglow Papers*. It is to be regretted that the volume does not contain a bibliography of Professor Ridgeway's writings—for which we would gladly exchange the account of the dinner in his honor.

The scholarly value of the papers is in general very high; they should be accessible to all classical investigators. The typography (by John Clay, at the University Press) is beyond praise; and the illustrations, a valuable feature of the volume, are all well executed.

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Die griechische Komödie. Von PROF. DR. ALFRED KÖRTE. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 400. Bändchen.) Leipzig, Berlin: Teubner, 1914. Pp. 104.

The New Greek Comedy, Κωμῳδία Νέα. By PH. E. LEGRAND. Translated by JAMES LOEB, A.B., with an introduction by JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, PH.D., LL.D. London: William Heinemann; New York: Putnam, 1917. Pp. xix+547.

In the compass of a hundred pages Körte attempts a "popular" essay, of interest to scholars only so far as it reveals the general notions of a specialist. The book presents orthodox belief in compact form. Within the limits of convention, however, Körte deviates slightly from the scheme of development followed in most contemporary handbooks. His account of Sicilian comedy is not qualified by skepticism regarding the traditional record of Epicharmus' activity; and the emphasis which he puts upon Epicharmus, Crates, and Pherecrates as precursors of Hellenistic comedy marks a reaction from the tendencies of contemporary criticism to the views of earlier historians of comedy. But in thorough consonance with recent criticism he attaches great significance to the influence, at least in respect to form, of tragedy upon later comedy. The series for which the essay is planned provides for a work on Roman comedy; Körte's account, therefore, of New Comedy rests on Menander, largely, without full consideration of the Greek material in the Latin plays; one misses, therefore, a comprehensive statement of the content and form of Hellenistic comedy such as Legrand has furnished.

The merits of the French original have been discussed in these columns. Mr. Loeb's translation, which is happily free from any evidences of being a translation, omits many scholarly footnotes, but seldom cuts the main text; the analysis of act-division in Plautus and Terence is the only considerable omission that I have observed, although the French version has been reduced one-third in the process of translation. Legrand adapted the book to the needs of the new audience, a task which Mr. Loeb in his preface calls "ungracious"! A very valuable addition is the full index, prepared under the supervision of Professor Capps.

Although Legrand's book is unquestionably the best available description of New Comedy, it is at times tedious reading, in its English form, for the general student of literature. It is often unnecessarily profuse in arraying examples of a given phase of comedy; the French author's style of exposition is sometimes clumsily mechanical; and in general a clear succinct statement of the essential features of content and form, described from the standpoint of a modern reader of ancient comedy, would serve much better the needs of the audience to whom Mr. Loeb addresses his translation. Decharme's essay on Euripides is more immediately satisfying. Readers of the Loeb

translations of classical authors will need stimulating studies of authors and of literary types to accompany their reading of the texts; without intending to be ungrateful for Mr. Loeb's excellent versions of both Decharme and Legrand, we should welcome independent studies of authors and types by English and American scholars; scholarship in this country and in England would profit if it were moved to prepare critical essays in which a sense of perspective and the graces of literary style are indispensable.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Latin Sentence Connection. By CLARENCE W. MENDELL, PH.D.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1917. Pp. x+214. \$1.50 net.

In the preface Dr. Mendell describes his work as "an attempt to discover a more fundamental standpoint for the consideration of sentence relations, and to do away with the somewhat artificial distinction between co-ordinate and subordinate by means of a more thorough understanding of the nature and origin of each." His first step is an analysis of the psychological processes which underlie the formation of sentences and their connection with one another. Sentences, he concludes, are never isolated units; adjacent sentences are always related in thought. The mere fact of juxtaposition shows relation, but the quality of the relation must somehow be conveyed to the mind of the hearer or reader if language is to be an adequate means of expressing thought. This treatise is a study of the means used by Latin writers to define sentence relations. It is based on an examination of Tacitus, Cato, Sallust, and the younger Pliny entire, of 300 pages each of Cicero and Seneca, of three books of Caesar, three of Livy, four of Quintilian, and four lives of Suetonius, besides many examples drawn from casual reading. The wide range of the author's material adds greatly to the value of his conclusions.

Dr. Mendell's analysis discovers three main elements in the expression of thought-relations—repetition, change, and incompleteness. Of these, the first two can be used only in the second of two adjacent sentences, the third in either. Repetition, the simplest and most natural means of expressing sentence relation, is discussed first. It consists in "the repetition in the second sentence of any element of the first, the element repeated being the bond which unites the two and defines their relation." The repetition may be semantic or morphological or, as the author prefers to state it, there may be repetition of content or repetition of function. The former is a simple example of the working of the laws of associative thinking. An idea from one sentence becomes the starting-point of the next. The sentence relation defined by repetition of content is, in general terms, logical subsequence.

The second sentence may merely add an item to the first; it may be explanatory; or it may express the result of the first. The relation is sometimes defined more precisely by the use of a conjunction. *Et*, *que*, and *atque* appear in sentences of the first type; *nam* and *enim* often mark the explanatory second sentence; *igitur*, *itaque*, *ergo*, and *quare* indicate result. *Autem* and *vero* with resumptive force are also sometimes used in connection with repetition of content. But the conjunctions, Dr. Mendell believes, have been introduced merely to add precision and emphasis to a relation already expressed. They are purely supplementary "until, by familiarity, they acquire the force which enables them to express a relation originally conveyed by more fundamental means." Repetition of content means repetition of an idea; functional repetition means repetition of construction, parallelism of structure. The usage is rhetorical in effect. Indeed, it lies at the basis of the rhetorical figure anaphora. The relation indicated is always that of logical coincidence. The sentences may be either parallel or contrasted. *Et* and *que*, with *aut* for negative sentences, are the only conjunctions used.

The next chapter deals briefly with the element of incompleteness when it appears in the second sentence. This retrospective use is unimportant, but must be understood for the better comprehension of the principle in its important field, the anticipatory. Conjunctions, demonstratives, relatives, comparatives, nouns, and verbs inherently relative in meaning occurring in the second sentence, all force the reader to look back for the complete meaning to the preceding. These are all examples of incompleteness of content. In none of these cases, however, does the element of incompleteness define the sentence relation. It merely calls attention to some other determining factor, usually repetition of content. Functional incompleteness may be illustrated by certain dependent uses of the subjunctive and by the relative tenses of the indicative, the pluperfect and future perfect. Except in the case of the pluperfect, whereby the second sentence is often marked as explanatory of the first, retrospective incompleteness of function does not define relation.

In the following chapter the author discusses the principle of change. Nearly every sentence shows decided change in content from the preceding. For this reason semantic change is effective as a means of defining sentence relation only when it is so abrupt as to suggest contrast and when it is confined to words which are either essentially or temporarily in the same category. The relation defined by semantic change is always the same, that of opposition or contrast. Functional change, change of mood and tense, has a wider range but is less efficient than semantic change. It is not in itself definite enough, as a rule, to express any precise sentence relation.

This completes the discussion of retrospective forms of connection. A detailed examination follows of the principle of incompleteness used as an

anticipatory connective element in the first sentence or clause. Most of the types noted in the examples of retrospective incompleteness may also be used with anticipatory force. The relation expressed is logical subordination, but in most sentences the precise definition of relation is determined by the meaning of the clause or by a conjunction. Sometimes, however, as in the use of comparatives or such words as *celerus* and anticipatory imperatives, an adversative or concessive relation is directly suggested. Dr. Mendell finds that this study of anticipatory means of connection throws interesting light on the growth of subordinate clauses. The expression of relation in the first sentence is, he says, consciously rhetorical and a "natural step in the rhetorical development of subordination." The connective element, by marking its own clause as logically antecedent, "draws attention to the following clause as the more important, logically, of the two." "This accounts," in his opinion, "for the development of subordinate clauses to do much of the work which might have been carried by these incomplete clauses, resulting in the tendency to look upon the more fundamental and normal types as an exceptional usage and as substitutes for the types with subordinating conjunctions."

In the short chapter on parenthetical incompleteness the author makes a further contribution to the study of subordination. The discussion deals with verbs, chiefly those of saying, thinking, or asking, injected parenthetically into sentences, which without them are syntactically complete, but to which the injected verbs give a tone of earnestness, apology, or the like. Owing to the logical incompleteness of the inserted verbs, the adjacent clause eventually developed into a syntactically subordinate relation. Subordinating conjunctions and particles were later often added, but were originally purely supplementary, the fundamental connective element being the incompleteness of the inserted verbs.

Those who are interested in the study of sentence connection from the standpoint of scientific syntax will welcome Dr. Mendell's work as both sound and stimulating. His analysis should give an impetus to the further investigation of the origins of Latin conjunctive usage. His methods will prove useful, too, in the study and classification of Greek conjunctions and particles.

As a rule Dr. Mendell's illustrations are very apt. Exception may be taken to his interpretation of the quotation from Caesar's *Bellum Alexandrinum* on p. 43. It may be true, as Dr. Mendell asserts, that "the most prominent characteristic of Rhodes which it possesses in common with Syria and Cilicia is that of being a Roman dependency," but the fact does not seem to me patent enough to warrant his using this as an example of sentence connection by repetition of category. Rather it is the parallelism due to repetition of the ablative that serves as a unifying element here. The instances of repetition of category on pp. 53 f. and 78 f. are much more convincing.

The book is excellently prepared with few typographical errors. On p. 38, l. 25, *utatur* occurs for *utatur*; on p. 168, l. 6, *cognosite* for *cognoscite*. There are two annoying errors in cross-reference. In the footnote on p. 103 the reference is quite irrelevant; on p. 195, l. 17, reference is made to p. 148 for further discussion of certain interjected verbs of saying, but no trace of such discussion appears on p. 148 or indeed elsewhere in the book, so far as I can find.

GRACE HADLEY BILLINGS

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

The Geography of Strabo. With an English Translation by HORACE LEONARD JONES, based in part upon the unfinished version of JOHN ROBERT SITTLINGTON STERRETT. (The Loeb Classical Library.) London: William Heinemann; New York: Putnam. 8 vols. Vol. I, pp. xliii+531.

Mr. H. L. Jones was asked to complete the translation of Strabo left unfinished at the death of his teacher and colleague Professor Sterrett, who was originally chosen as translator by the editors. The introduction and the exhaustive bibliography are mainly the work of Professor Sterrett. In these the chief point of interest for the student of Strabo is the discussion of two controversial questions—the purpose of Strabo's travels and the place and date of the writing of the *Geography*. Professor Sterrett follows Pais in the contention that Strabo did not travel on his own account, but in the interest of persons of exalted rank, not Romans, as Niese believes, but probably Pythodoris, queen of Pontus. On the question of the date and place of the composition of the *Geography* the author again supports Pais against Niese in the thesis that Strabo wrote at Amasia—far from Rome—some time about 7 B.C., but revised his work about 18 A.D.

In the first two books contained in Volume I Mr. Jones, to preserve the unity of the work as a whole, has substituted a more literal version for the free rendering made by Professor Sterrett, although acknowledging his indebtedness to that eminent scholar for much of the diction and other elements of style. The remaining books will be the independent work of Mr. Jones. The translation is in clear, readable English—not over-technical—though sufficiently close to the original. The reader will feel particularly indebted to the translator for the intelligible renderings of the sometimes unfamiliar and obscure vocabulary of Strabo, the lucidity of the involved mathematical passages, and the much-needed explanatory footnotes and geometrical drawings. However, not to renounce entirely the privileges of a reviewer, I must mention a few passages in which Mr. Jones's translation is open to criticism.

i. 1. 16: διαφερόντως δ' ἐπάγεσθαι δοκεῖ μοι πρὸς τὰ νῦν ἐκεῖνος ὁ λόγος διότι τῆς γεωγραφίας τὸ πλέον ἐστὶ πρὸς τὰς χρεῖας τὰς πολιτικές. "And that other argument is adduced with especial force in reference to the present day conditions, namely," etc. The parallel use of πρὸς τὰ νῦν in i. 2. 25, where it is translated by the author "to my present purpose," and the connotation of λόγος make the usual rendering "to my present argument" undoubtedly preferable here.

i. 1. 18: τοῦ ἑκαστον σώμα ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἄρτημα νεύειν. The tempting translation "And that each body inclines towards its own centre of gravity" might mislead the casual reader to attribute to Strabo the modern scientific knowledge implied by "centre of gravity." Strabo has borrowed for geographical purposes the word ἄρτημα, which elsewhere is used only in a mechanical sense—as in Herod 2. 69 (of earrings); Aristot. *Mech.* 18 (of a weight attached to a pulley); Plut. *Cat. Min.* 38; Plut. *Moral.* 591 D, 1129 E (of an attachment). Strabo wishes to say that each body tends toward that to which it is attached—the general mass to which it belongs.

i. 2. 3: λέγω δὲ τὸ πολλῶν ὑπάρχει τόπων ἔμπειρον ἢ στρατηγίας ἢ γεωργίας ἢ ῥητορικῆς ἅπερ ἢ ἀκροάσις, ὡς εἰκός, περιποιεῖ. "I again refer to the poet's being an expert in geography or generalship or agriculture or rhetoric in which subjects one's hearing of poetry naturally invests the poet with special knowledge." The author's failure to see that τὸ ἔμπειρον refers to the hearer, not to the poet, has led him into a mistranslation of περιποιεῖ—which bears the usual force of "procures"—of course for the hearer—the knowledge previously mentioned.

i. 2. 5: τίς ἂν οὖν ὑπολάβοι τὸν δυνάμενον ποιητὴν εἰσάγειν ῥητορεύοντας ἐτέρους καὶ στρατηγούντας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐπιδεικνυμένους τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔργα, αὐτὸν εἶναι τῶν φλυάρων ἓνα. The insertion of καὶ στρατηγούντας between ῥητορεύοντας and τὰ ἄλλα τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔργα indicates that Strabo used τῆς ἀρετῆς here in the larger sense of "excellence" not "the art of rhetoric."

i. 2. 6: ἢ λόγος μὲν ῥητορικὸς δὲ λόγος οὐκ ἔστι γενικὸς καὶ φράσις καὶ ἀρετὴ λόγου; Mr. Jones translates, "Or, rather, is discourse, in its broadest sense, generic, while rhetorical discourse is not generic, and style is simply an excellence of discourse?" καὶ is plainly copulative in both cases and introduces other terms for ῥητορικὸς λόγος—which are all alike not generic.

The context in i. 2. 8, βλέψαντες εἰς τὸ φυσικὸν πάθος τοῦ λογικοῦ ζώου, which the author renders, "since they had an insight into the emotional nature of the reasoning animal," does not point to anything but the usual colorless significance of πάθος as "tendency" or "affection," the phrase meaning simply "the natural tendency of the reasoning animal."

A few other inaccuracies in translation occur, such as "further north" instead of "south" for κατωτέρω in i. 3. 22 (cf. Herod. i. 72 and i. 142, etc.), and "students" for the accepted rendering "readers" in translating τοῖς προσιοῦσιν and τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ii. 5. 1. Iberia in ii. 4. 5 for τῆς τε Λιβύης is evidently a misprint.

A welcome addition to the forthcoming volumes will be the fuller index of proper names which, it is hoped, will be accompanied by more detailed maps of the sections of the ancient world described by Strabo.

GENEVA MISENER

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Pseudogaleni in Hippocratis de Septuuanis Commentarium ab Hunaino, q.f., Arabice Versum. Ex codice Monacensi primum edidit et Germanice vertit GOTTHELF BERGSTRAESSER. (Corpus Medicorum Graecorum, XI, 2, 1.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1914. Pp. xxiv+203.

We have at last here presented in a scholarly edition a work about which much has been said since Hardy many years ago published extracts from it. Since the controversy was started by Dr. W. H. Roscher regarding the date of the earlier parts of Hippocrates, *περὶ εβδομάδων*, scholars may have hoped to derive some light on that treatise from this commentary. This hope, it appears, was doomed to disappointment; for neither is it due to the pen of Galen, as a study of Hardy's extracts long ago convinced me, nor does its unknown author contribute anything of importance, either to Hippocrates or to the solution of the problems raised by Roscher. The value of the treatise, if it prove to possess any, will presumably be found to lie in the light it may some day shed on the later history of Greek medicine and on the devious ways of commentators.

Regarding the accuracy of the German rendering of the Arabic, my limited knowledge of the latter language does not permit me to speak. I had hoped to have the judgment of my friend, Professor Vanderbogart, of the Berkeley Divinity School, on this head; but the illness and untimely death of that scholarly Arabist prevented his taking more than a mere dip into Bergstraesser's work, and delayed this review. I can therefore give nothing more regarding this part of the editor's labors than the impression of the layman, that it is as carefully done as the remainder, which is in accord with the high standard set by the "Corpus Medicorum Graecorum." In this Corpus, which happier times may, I trust, bring to completion, the treatise had of course to be included, and we are grateful that the work of the editor, undertaken at the instance of Dr. Roscher and intended for separate publication, has been claimed and won by the general editors of the larger undertaking.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Das Leben und die Lehre Epikurs. Diogenes Laertius Buch X.

Uebersetzt und mit kritischen Bemerkungen versehen von
 ARTHUR KOCHALSKY. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1914.
 Pp. viii+78.

The translation occupies 59 pages; the critical notes, the remainder of the book. The editor and translator, Dr. Kochalsky, was already known by his Marburg dissertation, *De Sexti Empirici adversus logicos libris quaestiones criticae*, 1911, and by his contributions to Mutschmann's edition of Sextus Empiricus. But he is young, and it is well to bear this in mind in passing judgment on the present work.

His book on Epicurus has been highly praised; but it hardly deserves the encomiums pronounced upon it. It will be found to be serviceable if used with extreme caution; for, while it contains much that is good, it is the work of a novice where much learning and a schooled judgment are required. I know of no writer who makes greater demands upon the knowledge of the scholar than Epicurus. It is therefore a pity that, if such work as Kochalsky undertook was to be done, it should not have been reserved for more experienced hands. On almost every page of the critical notes the editor betrays his immaturity and his want of acquaintance with the work of competent scholars on the writings of Epicurus. He says that Epicurus had not been translated before. A glance even at Ruge would have taught him otherwise. It is a real misfortune that he did not know of Hamelin's *Epicure*, published in the *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, XVIII (1910), 397-440, where most of what he translates will be found better rendered. But this may not be wholly Kochalsky's fault, because Hamelin's paper was separately issued and for some reason not mentioned in the table of contents. Hence it has escaped the notice of bibliographers, and a friend, whom I directed to the article, failed to find it in a great university library, though the said volume was there, and the paging allowed for it!

An interesting example of Kochalsky's ignorance of previous literature on Epicurus occurs in connection with § 38 (pp. 13 and 63). In a "Note on Merbach's de Epicuri Canonica" in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for August 19, 1911, col. 1046, I called attention to the ludicrous and discreditable comedy of errors and ignorance of philological literature on the part of German scholars which centers around this passage. That comedy has apparently not yet reached the last act; for after the publication of the note appeared Arndt's thesis, and with a copy from the author there came to me a courteous note in effect begging for mercy, because he had been guilty of the same oversight that I had noted. But even this did not conclude the chapter; for now Kochalsky bases his note on Arndt; and gravely proposes, as his own emendation, *κατὰ πάντα*, which (so far as is known) originated with me in my "Epicurea," *A.J.P.*, XXIII (1902), 187, and was

also subsequently proposed by Dr. Brieger, in similar ignorance of my paper. Surely the critical study of a text implies some knowledge of the critical studies already published about it, does it not?

Regarding the translation and the notes in detail I will not now write. To do so would require much space and would give to Dr. Kochalsky's book an undeserved prominence. The large number of notes I have written on the margin will more fitly appear at a later time in an independent study of Epicurus, *si dis placet*.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

INDEX TO VOLUME XII

- Aelius Gallus, reorganizes irrigation system of Egypt **240 ff.**
- Agricola* 44. 1, discussed **197 f.**
- Andria*, ed. Sturtevant **327 f.**
- animals as guides in colonization **8**
- Anthology, Latin, epigram on contemplated burning of the *Aeneid* **376 ff.**; the *Carmen Augusti* a source of Petrarch **378 ff.**; epitaphs of Vergil **393**
- Antiquities, Greek and Roman, dictionary of, ed. Walters **311**
- Antiquity in life of the present, Cauer **212 f.**
- Apuleius, Story of Cupid and Psyche, Schroeder **116**; *The Golden Ass*, Adlington-Gaselee **202 ff.**
- Aristophanes, *Knights* 537 ff. **418 ff.**; scholia on *Knights* 537 ff. **421 ff.**; Frag. 333 **419**
- Aristotle, on rhet. frigidity **68 ff.**; *Poetics* 1449b on comedy **409 ff.**; *Ethics* 1128a **422 ff.**
- Augustus, and the grain production of Egypt **238, 239**; his correspondence with Horace and Vergil **368**; Petrarch's references to **371 ff.**; *Liber Octaviani Imperatoris*, identity of **375**
- Bennett, Kroll on the Latin subjunctive **121 ff.**
- Birds of the Latin Poets*, Martin **215 f.**
- Blass, the law of the avoidance of breves by Demosthenes **272 ff.**
- breves, avoidance of, by Demosthenes **271 ff.**
- Caecilius, on rhet. frigidity **71**
- Caesar, assumption of *toga virilis* by **95**; first wife of **93 ff.**; *The Civil Wars*, trans. Peskett **314**
- Campaign of Plataiai **39 ff.**
- Catalogue of the ships in the *Iliad*, leaf on **132**
- Cato, Valerius, adversaries of Hor. *Serm.* 1. 10 **77 ff.**; a possible fragment of **88**; *de urbano* **90**
- Catullus, *Selections from*, trans. Stewart **217 ff.**; seventeenth-century parody of **198 ff.**
- Chalcidius, commentary on *Timaeus* cccxviii **97**
- Cicero, *Att.* xiii. 33. 2 **305**; *Oration De Provinciis Consularibus* **304**; philosophical writings, Fessler **103 f.**; Professor Reid on **431 ff.**; *Prognostica* **302**
- civilization, Greek, in its historical development, von Scala **212 f.**
- Cleon, engineer in charge of land reclamation in Fayum **426-28**
- Clio Enthroned*, Lamb, **222 ff.**
- Codex of Pliny's *Letters* **259 ff.**
- cognomina of soldiers in the Roman legions, Dean **315**
- colonization, Greek, as influenced by oracles **1 ff.**
- comedy, antecedents of Hellenistic **405 ff.**; ancient theory of **405 ff.**; Doric farce in relation to Hellenistic **413 ff.**; Greek, Körte **442 f.**; mime and **414, 417**; mythological **411 ff.**; professional types in **413 ff.**; the cook in **414**; the physician in **413**
- companion to Greek studies, ed. Whibley **192 f.**
- comparative adjectives, in -(i)usculus **60 ff.**; as real diminutives **60**; hypocoristic **60 f.**; deteriorative **61**; show notion of approximation to primitive **61 ff.**; derived from comparatives which compare with other things possessing same quality **62 f.**; from comparatives which themselves designate a mere approximation to the primitive **63 f.**

- Corrado, Sebastian, criticizes statement of Petrarch 400 ff.
- Cossutia, marriage to Caesar 93 ff.
- Crates, as precursor of Hellenistic comedy 418 ff.
- Delphic oracle and Greek colonization 1 ff.
- Demetrius, on rhet. frigidity 71 ff.
- Demosthenes, avoidance of breves 271 ff.
- Dental terminations 21 ff.; 173 ff.; 295 ff.
- deteriorative adjectives, in Latin 49 ff.; expressing contempt 49 ff.; expressing hate or anger 49, 53; developed from and combined with diminutive notions 50 f.; hypocorisms 51 f.; without recognizable diminutive hypocoristic elements 53 ff.; in -(i)usculus 61
- diminution, Latin, of adjectives 49 ff.
- diminutives, Latin adjectival, list of 65 ff.; of quality 56 ff.; principally from adjectives of large size 57; of color 57 ff.; and comparative adjectives in -(i)usculus 61 ff.; their origin 64 f.
- dimittere* used of divorce 94
- Dodona and colonization 3 f.
- Domitius Marsus, *de urbanitate* 89
- Donatus, Aelius, commentary on Vergil's *Eclogues* 366; *Vita Vergilii* of 366 ff.
- Egypt, the irrigation system reorganized under Augustus 237 ff.
- Epicharmus, in relation to Hellenistic comedy 410 ff.; the debate in 414 ff.
- Epicurus, Life and Teaching of*, Kuchalsky 449 f.
- ἔργον as parallel for *opus* 437
- Ethnology and the Golden Age* 351 ff.
- Euripides, archaism in, Manning 205 ff.; chorus of, Phoutrides 205 ff.
- Eustathius, 353. 40, interpreted 97
- Fayum, land reclamation in 426 ff.
- Firmicus Maternus, *Mathesis* of, ed. Kroll, Skutsch, Ziegler 219
- frigidity in Greek rhetoric 68 ff.
- Furius Bibaculus (in Hor. *Serm.* 1. 10) 86; poems of 87; relation to Catullus 88 n. 1; in Virgilian *Catalepta* *ibid.*; *simius iste* 87
- Golden Age, Ethnology and the* 351 ff.
- Gorgias, rhetorical frigidity of 68 ff.
- Grammar of the Greek New Testament, Robertson 117 ff.
- grammatici*, social station 330; called *litteratores* 332
- H symbol in Cicero *Att.* xiii. 33. 2 305
- Heinsius, Daniel 307
- Hermogenes, on rhetorical frigidity 73
- Hesiod, description of winter in 225 ff.
- hexameter, number of words in, noticed by ancient metricians 97 ff.; *δλιγομετρα* and *πολυμετρα* in 97 ff.
- Homer, Poetry of*, Finsler, 212 f.
- Horace, and Valerius Cato 77 ff.; and Furius Bibaculus 86; *Serm.* 1. 10 adversaries of, and other personal allusions 85; *simius iste* 87; concordance to the works of, ed. Cooper 311; *Sermones* 11. 34-39 discussed 434 f.; studied in Italy, Curcio 119 f.
- inscription, supposedly Rhodian 190 f.
- irrigation in Fayum in third century B.C., chronology of 426 ff.; the system in Egypt reorganized by Aelius Gallus 239 ff.
- Ithaka, Homeric account of 133 ff.; tradition regarding 133 ff.
- (i)usculus, comparative adjectives in 60 ff.
- Jerome, Petrarch's use of 386 ff.
- Jews among the Greeks and Romans, Radin 210 f.
- John of Salisbury, story of bronze fly at Naples 403; Petrarch's knowledge of 403 ff.
- Κωμῳδία Νέα*, Legrand 442 f.
- Kroll, his theory of the Latin subjunctive 121 ff.

- Latin Sentence Connection*, Mendell 443 ff.
- Latinitas* 345 and note 1
- Leukas, Ithaka controversy 132 ff.
- Livy, Case Usage in*, Steele 222
- Longinus, on rhetorical frigidity 70
- Lucilius, biography 78 n. 1; characterization of 79; definition of literary genus satire 83
- Lucretius iv. 1125 discussed 306
- Macrobius, *Saturnalia* known to Petrarch 372
- Marcellus, chided by Vergil 401, 402 ff.
- marriage of males at an early age among the Romans 96 ff.
- Menander, recently discovered fragments of, ed. Sudhaus 110 ff.; studies in, Sudhaus 110 ff.
- Messala Corvinus, fragment of 332; avoidance of Greek words 346; purist 344
- Military Annals of Greece*, Snyder 116
- Nelli, Francesco, quotation from *Vita Vergilii* 396
- νεώτεροι, use of Greek words 338; neoteric poets and Latin purists 329
- Noun-formation, studies in Greek 21 ff.; 173 ff.; 295 ff.
- Ocium Heinsii* 307
- Octavia, mourning for Marcellus 389 ff.
- Odysseus as sun-god 244 ff.
- Oidipus*, Robert 208 ff.
- δλιγομερία and πολυμερία in the Homeric hexameter 97 ff.
- Opus est*, Greek parallels for 436 ff.
- oracles and Greek colonization 1 ff.; types of questions to 5 ff.; types of answers 6 ff.; aetiological 9 ff.; forgery of 19 ff.
- oso- and -lento-, semantic variability and equivalents of, Nichols 113 ff.
- painting, references to, in Plautus and Terence 143 ff.
- parody, of Catullus 4, 198
- Petrarch, sources of Vergilian biography known to 366; arguments of Sabbadini for knowledge of Suetonian *Vita Vergilii* by 367 ff.; hallucinations as to ancient works read 374 ff.; ancient authors unknown to him 396; his interpretation of Vergil *Eclogues* 1. 28 398
- Petronius and the Greek romance 158
- Pherecrates and Hellenistic comedy 421
- Philology, Latin, studies in, Stampini 216 f.
- Pinaros Rhakendytes, on rhetorical frigidity 74
- plants mentioned in colonization oracles 8 f.
- Plataiai, campaign of 30 ff.
- Plato, lost joke of 308; *Rep.* 368A discussed 436; *Theages* 124E discussed 201
- Plautus *Bacchides* 434 discussed 307; *Menaechmi*, trans. Drake 327; references to painting in 143 ff.; trans. Nixon 325
- Pliny, *Letters*, trans. Melmoth-Hutchinson 207 f.; a Venetian codex of 259 ff.
- Plotius Sacerdos, on the number of words in the dactylic hexameter 97 ff.
- Poseidonios und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese*, Gronau 107 f.
- Plutarch, *Caesar* 5 94; *Lives*, trans. Perrin 312
- Prodicus of Ceos, Mayer 119
- Prognostica*, Cicero's 302
- Propertius, allusion of to the *Aeneid* 367, 370 ff.
- Pseudogaleni in Hippocratis de Septuauianis Commentarium ab Hunaino*, Bergstraesser 448
- Ψυχρότης in Greek rhetoric 68 ff.
- purists, Latin 346; stylistic principles (Horace) 348; (Messala) 344, 349; (Asinius Pollio) 344; (Tibullus) 350
- Qui* and *quod* clauses, restrictive, subjunctive in 253 ff.

- Rambaldi, Benvenuto, acquaintance with Donatus' *Vita Vergilii* **395**
- Reid, on Cicero **431 ff.**
- religions, oriental in Roman paganism, Cumont and Gehrich **117**
- Republic* 368A discussed **436**
- Rhodian inscription, re-examined **190 f.**
- Ridgeway, William, *Essays and Studies Presented to*, ed. Quiggin **439 ff.**
- Roman or nationalistic school of poets **349**
- romance, Greek, and Petronius **158**
- St. Augustine's *Tractates*, on the date and delivery of **191 ff.**
- Scholia, to the *Iliad*, as introduction to ancient Homeric philology, Deecke **219**
- simius iste*, Furius Bibaculus **86**; or another follower of Cato **330**
- Spain under the Roman Empire*, Bouchier **211 f.**
- Stoicheia*: studies in ancient astrology, Pfeiffer **316 ff.**
- Strabo, the *Geography* of, trans. Sterrett-Jones **446 ff.**
- subjunctive, in restrictive *qui* and *quod* clauses **253 ff.**; Latin, Kroll's theory of **121 ff.**
- Suetonius *Iulius* **193 ff.**
- sun-god, Odysseus as **244 ff.**
- Syria as a Roman Province*, Bouchier **211 f.**
- Tacitus *Agricola* 44. 1 discussed **197 f.**
- temple? may a hero have a **96 f.**
- Terence *Andria*, ed. Sturtevant **327 f.**; aspect of the verb in, Barbelenet **220 f.**; references to painting in **143 ff.**
- Theages* 124E discussed **201**
- Theater, architectural development of the ancient, Fiechter **214 f.**
- Theodorus, engineer in charge of land reclamation in Fayum **426-28**
- Theognis, rhetorical frigidity of **73 ff.**
- Theophrastus, definition of frigidity **71**
- Timaus*, Chalcidius' commentary on, discussed **97**
- Tractates*, St. Augustine's, on the gospel and epistle of St. John **191 f.**
- Urbanus, *de urbanitate* **88**
- Varia Topographica* **194 ff.**
- Varus, defeat of and the German frontier policy of Augustus, Oldfather and Canter **105 ff.**
- velim, nolim, malim*, Kroll's theory of **125**
- Vergil, *Eclogues* 4. 49 discussed **308**; modern study of the biographies of **365**; variant tradition as to place of death **367, 369**; the epithet "Parthenias" **383**; education at Naples **384 ff.**; detractors of **386 ff.**; material fortunes of **388**; *recitatio* of *Aeneid* vi **389 ff.**; slowness in composition **390**; partiality for seclusion **390 ff.**; age of, at death **392 ff.**; prematurely gray **397 ff.**; teachers of **399**; his use of Greek words **347**; origins of his style, *ibid.*
- Victorinus, Marius, on the number of words in the dactylic hexameter **100**

